Building Capacity For Self-Help

A Survey on the Role of Alberta's Municipalities in Community Economic Development

by

William T. Perks and Neil MacDonald
Faculty of Environmental Design
Urban and Regional Research Laboratory
The University of Calgary

for

Policy Research Services
Municipal Services Branch
Alberta Municipal Affairs
Edmonton, Alberta

July, 1988

91-02845/

FOREWORD

An increasing number of municipalities are asking about the role of the municipal corporation in furthering and assisting economic development. In February 1988, the Municipal Services Branch hosted an Alberta Municipal Affairs Exchange[1] to discuss these questions and to better appreciate what this Department and other provincial agencies are doing in this field. Following from the AMA Exchange it was decided to survey some municipalities and report on the opinions, perceptions and preferences of their officials. Along with recording municipal experiences, the authors have reveiwed related literature and offer observations and conclusions.

This study serves as a "benchmark" rather than as a definitive statement of the municipality's roles and responsibilities in local economic development. Also, in reading this report, you will recognize that community economic development (CED) cuts across organization/departmental boundaries. As such. this investigation is part of a larger municipal mosaic which needs to be explored to more fully appreciate the municipal and provincial roles and responsibi'ities.

The municipalities are indicating the need for strengthening their corporate organizations. Such organizations are key to be successful in CED. In stepping back from this observation, one might conclude this may be pointing to a shift in the "business" focus of municipal government (or at least from those surveyed). This shift is exemplified when municipalities are pursuing corporate management, policy research and organizational developmsnt - all of these activities are indicative of a capacity building 'bent' to further develop local government in Alberta. Such a shift (from administration to the corporation) when coupled with the thrust of self-help or 'servant leadership'[2], is evidence of sustaining healthy communities. Within Alberta Municipal Affairs, this shift is apparent by using municipal corporate reviews, continuing administrative services and initiating municipal visioning exercises.

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors. The Municipal Services Branch hopes this write-up will contribute to furthering discussions on the municipalities' role in CED initiatives. We also hope this leads to a broader examination of municipal capacity-building across Alberta.

Policy Research Services
Municipal Services Branch, AMA

[1] An A.M.A. Exchange is an 'inter-divisional and mostly informal sharing of information'. The first Exchange, held on Feb. 3/88, was on local economic development initiatives. The results were a snapshot of related programs and an improved understanding of the respective roles of the Department staff. Proceedings of the Exchange are available from the Municipal Services Branch.

[2] As W. Walchuk notes in Alberta's Local Governments: People in Community Seeking Goodness, new directions in leadership point to a focus on service and a greater sharing of the leadership function. Servant leadership implies a foresight and a deep sense of mission.

52.529.08.09.88

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study of "Community Economic Development and the Role of the Municipal Corporation" was carried out in February-May, 1988 by the Urban and Regional Laboratory, Faculty of Environmental Design, The University of Calgary, under a research contract with Alberta Municipal Affairs (AMA).

The authors wish to acknowledge the superb cooperation given to this study by the Chief Administrative Officers, Mayors and Economic Development Officers in the municipalities surveyed. Several of these individuals further participated in lengthy interviews, without which the study would not have been as keenly informed as it has been.

The AMA Project Officer for this study was William Ashton, Senior Economist. His guidance, along with Ian Wights knowledge of corporate municipal matters and their combined insights contributed invaluably throughout all phases of the project.

Computer data entry and statistical routines were done by Chris Kielpinski and text processing by Amanda Chisholm.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Key Findings	1
A. The Corporate Municipal Role in Community Economic Development	1
B. Legislative Instruments	2
C. Key Development Programmes For Community Economic Development	2
D. Issues and Constraints in the Municipalities' Efforts to Carry Out Community Economic Development	3
Recommendations	3
1 OUTLINES OF THE STUDY AND REPORT	6
1.1 Aims of the Study	6
1.2 Background and Context	7
1.3 Limitations of the Study and Caveats	8
1.4 The Report	9
2 THE ROLE OF THE MUNICIPALITY IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGES SOUGHT	12
2.1 Assistance to Private Sector	12
2.2 Methods for Attracting New Business and Industry	13
2.3 Changes Desired In the Municipality's Role	13
2.4 Perceived Roles in CED	14
2.5 Observations and Conclusions: The Capacity of the Municipality to Do Community Economic Development	16
3 LEGISLATIVE INSTRUMENTS THAT SUPPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES: PERCEIVED ADEQUACY AND CHANGES SOUGHT BY THE MUNICIPALITIES	17
3.1 The Municipal Government Act -- Bonusing and Incentives	17
3.2 The Municipal Taxation Act	18
3.3 The Planning Act	18
3.4 The Role of the Regional Planning Commission	19
3.5 Observations and Conclusions	19
4 MUNICIPALITIES' OUTLOOK AND THE PRESENT STATE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	21
4.1 Current Outlooks on the Future	21
4.2 Major Issues in Dealing With CED (Q. 33.0 and 34.0)	21
4.3 Major Obstacles and Barriers to Doing CED	24
4.4 Conclusions and Observations	25

5 KEY ALBERTA PROGRAMMES FOR COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: PERCEIVED ADEQUACY AND CHANGES SOUGHT BY MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED 27

5.1 Views and Opinions on the Package of Programmes and Their Workings 27
5.2 Changes Desired in Provincial Programmes 29
5.3 Observations and Conclusions 32

6 FACTORS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES' APPRECIATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMMES 33

6.1 Advisory Services and Communications 33
6.2 Design and Delivery of Programmes 33
6.3 Observations and Conclusions 33

7 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER AMA ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES 35

7.1 Limited Responses 35
7.2 Observations and Conclusions 35

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 36

APPENDIX 2 ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 37

APPENDIX 3 DATA AND COMMENTARY ON THE MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 39

APPENDIX 4 STATISTICAL TABULATIONS
Available under separate cover from Alberta Municipal Affairs (see p.10)

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 MUNICIPALITIES IN THE STUDY SURVEY, WITH INDICATORS OF SIZE AND STATUS 11

TABLE 2 WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF YOUR MUNICIPALITY IN FURTHERING AND /OR ACHIEVING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 16

TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR OBSTACLES AND BARRIERS REPORTED BY THE RESPONDENTS 23

TABLE 4 RESPONDENT'S VIEWS ABOUT SELECTED ASPECTS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES 28

TABLE 5 CHANGES DESIRED TO PROVINCIAL PROGRAMMES 30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Twenty-five municipalities and five "Community Futures" (twenty-eight responded) projects in Alberta were surveyed to gather information and the opinions of local administrators about the workings of Community Economic Development (CED). The key findings in this Executive Summary are grouped according to: the role of municipal corporations in assisting and furthering CED; legislative instruments; provincial programmes; and issues and constraints. Eight recommendations are offered.

KEY FINDINGS

A. THE CORPORATE MUNICIPAL ROLE IN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (CED)

What succeeds?

A1. Only half of the Municipalities report that their **role as "facilitator to local business"** has been **"successful"**.

A2. About half of the Municipalities report that **"promotions and advertising"** have been **successful** in attracting new enterprises. A large majority of the municipalities report they are inhibited by financial limitations from doing more in this area.

A3. Only a handful of Municipalities report tax incentives, bonuses and grants as being either applied or a successful means in achieving their goals.

What role change is sought?

A4. Most of the Municipalities are seeking a **stronger, more active role** in CED activities:

- A4.1 they **emphasize that an effective role will be possible only if provincial aid** is forthcoming;
- A4.2 with but few exceptions, they would prefer that all forms of **"bonusing" be proscribed.** The general desire is to have equitable opportunity to compete with wealthier or larger urban centres;
- A4.3 a third of them would see the Municipality as a "financial partner" in private sector projects;

A4.4 **city Municipalities are generally opposed** to having a role in "venture capital corporations"; **half of the towns favour such a role**; and

A4.5 only a few of the municipalities regard maintaining an "arms length" relationship with private sector interests as a sufficient role of the municipality.

Do municipalities have the capacity? Can they compete?

A5. Generally -- and especially so for the towns -- neither Municipal Corporations alone or the CED organizations they participate with possess the **requisite capacity to engage effectively in on-going CED**. Most significantly:

A5.1 **volunteer efforts** (supported as they usually are by skeleton financial resources) are **wearing thin in most communities.** This can lead to the demise of CED as a vital force in small towns survival and adjustment to economic changes;

A5.2 **inadequate funding** for CED organization, plan-making, on-going management and implementation is reported by almost all of the respondents; and

A5.3 most of the Municipalities feel **frustration and resentment** about their inability to **compete** with Edmonton or Calgary and with municipalities larger than themselves. (See also C3, below.)

B. LEGISLATIVE INSTRUMENTS

Are the three provincial Acts adequate and appreciated?

B1. With the exception of the repeal of S.443 of the **Municipal Government Act**, this Act and the **Municipal Taxation Act** are **perceived as adequate** to the Municipal Corporation's present role in CED.

B1.1 However, it is probable that changes to one or both of these Acts would be required if Municipal Corporate roles were to be expanded into areas of enterprise partnerships with private investors.

B2. By and large, Municipalities are **content with the provisions of the Planning Act**. No suggestions were made for altering it.

B2.1 Notwithstanding, the machinery and application of the **Planning Act** does not meet with universal praise. Most commonly cited are over-regulation and a slow approvals process; among lesser size municipalities, feelings of "not heard" are common; and

B2.2 **An appropriate role for the regional planning commissions** in CED is an emergent issue; see Recommendation #7, below.

C. KEY PROVINCIAL PROGRAMMES FOR COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Are the programmes well communicated?

C1. **Awareness** of the full scope and range of programme opportunities is **low**. Over two-thirds of the Municipalities regard full and detailed **communication** regarding programme operations, accessibility, availability of funds, etc. as **very poor**.

Are the programmes good enough? Who benefits?

C2. Over half of the Municipalities regard the present package of policies and programmes as variously **not good enough** or **poorly suited.**

C3. Almost all of the Municipalities point to **red tape** as a significant inhibitor in accessing economic development programmes.

C4. Over half of the Municipalities cite **gaps between promise and delivery, lack of coordination among and between programmes, and overlaps.**

C5. All but a few Municipalities have the impression that the **benefits of programmes flow to the larger municipalities** -- Calgary and Edmonton especially. In addition, the smaller the Municipality, the stronger the feeling that programme services and benefits go to the larger cities or towns in their region.

D. ISSUES AND CONSTRAINTS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES' EFFORTS TO CARRY OUT COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

D1. A range of issues, obstacles and constraints is reported.

D1.1 **Lack of Financial Resources and Funding for Planning and Implementation** is cited by **all respondents.**

D1.2 A constraint of **inadequate capacity** is cited by the **large and small towns.**

D1.3 Issues related to **social and community development** are cited by the **small towns, the cities and the Community Futures respondents.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. With the basic objective of enhancing the **capacity** of Municipal Corporations and their partnered community organizations, **training seminars and courses** should be arranged by the relevant provincial departments. These should cover the basics of CED objectives and experience; the significance of CED to ensuring the future survival or well-being of the community; training in leadership roles; and training in techniques for planning, strategizing, implementing and managing an on-going CED programme.

1.1 As a first step, **AMA should consider staging an "Exchange"** that brings the CAOs and the Economic Development Officers of a selected number of municipalities together with provincial officials representing the key economic development departments, to discuss mutual experiences with economic development policies, planning and programming, and to explore appropriate training models, eligibility criteria, market size, marketing of courses, etc.

1.2 At the outset, in selecting participants, top priority should be given to the towns;

1.3 Senior managers of the Municipal Corporation, Municipal Councillors and Economic Development Officers, and volunteers appointed to CED organizations should all be recipients of training; and

1.4 The costs of participating in training should be largely, if not completely offset by provincial grants to the municipalities and/or travel and fee subsidies to participants.

2. Information and related processing technologies are key to enhancing the on-going role of the municipal corporation and community organizations in strategizing, decision-making and implementation related to all "development" functions. A study is needed to determine data base needs with respect to CED and other roles carried by the Municipal Corporation. Such a study should further consider:

2.1 information processing technologies appropriate to the full range of corporate municipal responsibilities;

2.2 the feasibility of establishing a central data/statistical system accessible by the Municipal Corporations in real time;

2.3 easily-accessed "window" files on economic, demographic and social data/forecasts; on resources inventories; and

2.4 window files on futures scenarios that are produced by provincial departments.

3. Provincial departments emphasize the philosophy of "self help" at the local level. It is not clear however, what self-help means operationally or how the demonstration of it (or not) conditions departmental responses to municipal aspirations (see An AMA Exchange: Local Economic Development Initiatives pp. 7, 11, 14). Similarly, "commitment" is equally emphasized and ambiguous. It is recommended that:

3.1 Advisories, forums and/or seminars should be implemented with these objectives in view:

3.2 Defining more coherently in policy and operational terms, what CED is intended to accomplish and what is meant by "self-help";

3.3 Focussing more on youth involvements in both visioning and implementation stages of CED plans;

3.4 Moving the Municipal Corporation towards a pro-active role in CED.

4. Self-help is but one component of municipal corporate and community organizational capacity for carrying out CED. Additional ways and means of building-up community capacity should be considered; for example:

4.1 leadership and community development training courses for elected officials, volunteers and service organizations;

4.2 skills upgrading and management education for municipal corporation managers;

4.3 demonstration projects in "model" or successful approaches to CED;

4.4 reporting and conferencing on demonstration projects; and

4.5 ad-hoc funding and/or sustained program funding to municipalities for 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5.

5. Though not an essential corrective, it would help to dispel the ambiguity of intention that has attended the repeal of S.443 of the Municipal Act. The most effective means would be a change to the Act.

6. An appropriate **role for the Regional Planning Commissions** in CED needs to be formulated. If the Commissions are to assume a role in economic development, RPC personnel should be trained, and RPC organizations in general should be up-graded for carrying out research and information roles in CED; and for providing ad hoc, quick-response Physical Environment Design services to their constituent municipalities. RPCs should not, however, become agents for performing CED planning or engaging in implementation decisions.

7. Consideration should be given to **inter-departmental coordination and integration** in the delivery of economic development programmes funding and services at the local levels, such that:

7.1 more comprehensive and strategic (as opposed to sectoral and ad hoc) CED organization and planning can be achieved;

7.2 organizational and volunteer resources in the Community can be concentrated (rather than spread) and thereby deployed more efficiently and with better effect; and

7.3 Municipal Corporate resources can be deployed with better efficiency and integration, and therefore with more impact across a range of social, cultural and economic objectives in the community.

1 OUTLINES OF THE STUDY AND REPORT

1.1 Aims of the Study

The study looks at the general conditions of the dynamic--"**Programmes**" and "**Municipal Capacities**". From enquiries into the perceptions and experience of municipal officials, the study provides a broad perspective on the current workings of CED in Alberta. This includes insights into the issues and concerns held by community leaders with respect to: communication and delivery of government programmes; local capacities to engage effectively in CED; the adequacy of legislative instruments to support municipalities; and the roles that can or should be assumed by the municipal corporation in furthering CED goals.

The principal aims of the study are:

- o To determine what are appropriate roles for the Municipal Corporation in Community Economic Development (CED), with special reference to: 1) partnership with CED organizations in the community, and 2) legislative provisions;

- o To gain an understanding of existing obstacles and constraints, and issues and concerns facing municipalities and their community organizations; and

- o To gather suggestions from municipal administrators with respect to new or improved advisory services and assistance that Alberta Municipal Affairs could be offering to local administrations.

These objectives have been met by analysing the views and opinions of local administrators -- CAO's and economic development officers. The views and opinions expressed have been complemented by references to documented experience (as noted in the bibliography) and opinions regarding community development, legislative instruments, and municipal administrative practices.

Since the municipal corporation is but one actor in Community Economic Development (CED), the study necessarily examines the "shape" of CED activities in cities and towns, with the purpose of forming an understanding about:

- -The state of awareness and appreciation of government programmes and technical advisory services related to economic development;
- -The perception and outlook of local administrations with respect to the accessibility, operational policies and effectiveness of economic development programmes; and
- -The perceived needs and desires of local communities, including changes they would like to see regarding legislation or programmes;

-How CED is organized and carried out and what are the capacities of municipalities to engage in CED.

Facts about CED activity, and the attitudes, perceptions and opinions of municipal administrators were researched by means of a Sample Survey Questionnaire and selected follow-up Interviews. These are described in Appendices 1 and 2.

1.2 Background and Context

Since the mid 1970's the Province has been highly instrumental in promoting and funding, and assisting in other ways, Community Economic Development (CED). Alberta Economic Development and Trade, Alberta Tourism and Agriculture are the principal agents in this respect. The Municipal Affairs programme, "Revitalizing Downtown Alberta," offers another development instrument, albeit of quite recent origin (1987). Formerly, joint provincial /municipal ventures were promoted in rural communities on a sub-regional basis. The provincial government intended that this program would foster locally supported projects. These projects would then continue on their own to meet local economic development needs. Eight rural development projects were designated and received financial support before being terminated in 1988.

An alternative federal government programme--"Community Futures"--now operates at the local level and potentially offers substantial resources to assist CED. To date, 17 Alberta municipalities are designated participants in this programme. Some 30 additional provincial and federal programmes or sub-programmes can be said to support, directly or indirectly, CED initiatives.

The programmes variously provide for: funding of business creation or expansion; funding of employment creation; management, planning and other technical or business counselling services; organizational funding; capital loans of various kinds; grants; training for business management or job skills; and market research services.

To one degree or another, every Alberta municipality is currently occupied with economic development. Until recently, CED was not an area where Alberta Municipal Affairs was commonly called upon to be of service. Historically--from a municipal perspective--CED took care of itself through the efforts of local entrepreneurs acting individually and was aided by a bouyant resource economy. "Boosterism" has often been present, but very little locally-planned CED occurred. Social and cultural aspects of CED were often not considered in these efforts. During tougher times, CED was often aided by senior government programmes. The circumstances leading to the change in approaches to municipal CED were: shrinking/stagnating assessment bases; deteriorating assessment

rates; population movement away from rural areas and towns; economic declines in the major economic sectors agriculture and energy; surplus lot inventories and under utilized infrastructure capacity; and increasing debt loads in times of decreasing fiscal capacity.

The desire for growth in many municipalities that was so prevalent in the 1970's has been replaced by a desperation to avoid decline. Today, most municipalities engage in planning, promotion and the management of economic development through some form of community-based organization. The municipal corporation is the financial sponsor and a participating agent. Moreover, an expectation generally held is that the municipal corporation will assume one or more roles in creating conditions and offering inducements favourable to business and industries. These roles invariably have municipal expenditure and revenue implications, and they excite questions having to do with the appropriateness and the boundaries of municipal corporation involvement in certain types of economic development action.

A large set of senior government programmes are potentially accessible to the municipal corporation and their economic development organizations. Municipal corporations are motivated to engage in economic development through a sense of urgency about declining fiscal positions or by the desire to better the economic, social, and/or cultural conditions of their community. This twin set of conditions leads to concerns about "**capacity**"--that is, the ability of a municipal corporation and/or its community based organizations to organize, marshal resources, plan and manage on-going community economic development activities. **Capacity is determined by** available expert skills, communication and information flows, technologies at hand, aquireable local financial resources of crucial importance--the time available to local volunteers, politicians and municipal administrators to engage in CED activities.

1.3 Limitations of the Study and Caveats

The budget and time frame of this study precluded a survey of all cities and towns in the province. Similarly, time and budget constraints did not allow for random sampling and the extended, systematic data gathering procedure that it requires. Since random sampling was not performed, statistical results presented in the report cannot be generalized for all cities and towns.

Rural municipalities were not surveyed, although through the inclusion of 5 Community Futures Organizations in the study, rural opinions were obtained. One of the Community Futures entities sampled is actually a single municipality (Crowsnest Pass). The other four all include one or more towns. Thus, the findings of the Survey with respect to the Community Futures category in the sample do, in an important measure, speak to the municipal corporate situation of towns.

The sample of 30 municipalities (28 responses) is of substantial size (26% of the cities and towns in Alberta). See Table 1 for the list of municipalities sampled. The municipalities were selected for certain representativeness--eg. primarily geographic location and population size. Therefore, although not random, the sample is stratified and representative. The findings are reported in three ways: as percentages, numbers and/or proportions of municipalities responding to the particular question.

1.4 The Report

Section 2 deals directly with the question of municipal corporate roles. It outlines the **roles currently assumed** by municipalities in the workings of CED; and it reports the preferences of the respondents for **changes in role** or mandate of the municipal corporation.

Section 3 deals with the respondents' views about the **adequacy of the legislative instruments** governing the scope and initiatives of the **municipal corporation.** The opinions expressed are compared to opinions and studies, such as *Development Incentives: The Advantages and Disadvantages of Municipal Financial and Land Use Incentives* (see Bibliography); various presentations made at the "AMA Exchange," February 3, 1988; and published articles.

In **Section 4**, we report on the essential features of local economic development organization, initiatives and outlook. What **issues and obstacles** are encountered in municipalities? What is the level of **resources** dedicated to CED activities? Are the respondents **optimistic or pessimistic** about their community's future development? Beyond these questions, we examine and reflect on the concept of "**self-help**" which pre-conditions provincial programmes delivery.

Section 5 reports on the perceived accessibility and administration, promises and delivery, coordination and communication of the **key provincial programmes.** What respondents think about the programmes is related to the type of the municipality (ie. city, large town, small town, or Community Futures participant).

Section 6 deals very briefly with the administrators' **awareness** of the programmes available to the municipal corporation. The corollary of awareness--**communications** about provincial programmes, and perceptions about **design and delivery**--are also reported.

In **Section 7**, we report on the views of the respondents regarding possible **aids and services** they feel Alberta Municipal Affairs might consider offering to municipalities.

Description and explanation of the **Survey Questionnaire** (Appendix 1), and of the **Sample Procedures** (Appendix 2), are included with the report.

Appendix 3 provides a compendium of taxation and other data for the municipalities surveyed, along with commentary on the status and financial capacities of these cities and towns. These data and commentary were prepared and written by the Municipal Services Branch, Alberta Municipal Affairs. The opinions expressed are those of the Branch.

Appendix 4, under separate cover, consists of the Questionnaire **statistical tabulations**, presented question by question in computer print-out form. This Appendix is available from the Municipal Services Branch, Policy Research Services, Edmonton. Tel. 427-2523 or 427-7794.

TABLE 1
MUNICIPALITIES IN THE STUDY SURVEY,
WITH INDICATORS OF SIZE AND STATUS

	POPULATION (AMA 1987)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT MIX (1987)	TOTAL MUNICIPAL TAXATION INDEX	PERSONAL INCOME INDEX (Prov. Avg=100)
A. CITIES				
Red Deer	54,309	35.8<	97.6<	98
St. Albert	37,008	20.2<	193.6>	121
Fort McMurray	34,949	23.0<	70.7<	146
Grande Prairie	26,471	42.1>	94.7<	99
Airdrie	10,461	32.3<	127.6>	82
Wetaskiwin	10,103	38.1<	99.0<	81
All Cities Avg.		39.3	100	102
B. LARGE TOWNS				
Brooks	9,464	34.4<	94.3<	93
Hinton	8,629	46.5>	106.6>	115
Edson*	7,323	45.9>	80.0<	88
Taber	6,382	38.0>	72.7<	84
Peace River	6,355	46.8>	54.8<	97
Whitecourt	5,737	45.8>	47.1<	91
Rocky Mtn. House	5,261	41.5>	114.4>	75
Stettler	5,147	36.9>	92.9<	89
St. Paul	5,128	35.1>	89.1<	74
High River	5,096	31.0<	81.1<	91
All Large Towns Avg.		35.0	100	91
C. SMALL TOWNS				
Coaldale	4,811	15.9<	81.7<	81
Grande Cache	3,646	40.9>	108.7>	106
Grande Centre	3,655	42.3>	109.5>	80
Fort MacLeod	3,123	40.8>	99.7<	72
Hanna	3,017	34.0<	128.4>	85
Valleyview*	2,218	43.0>	143.6>	69
Athabasca	1,970	48.3>	114.1>	78
Bow Island	1,566	40.1>	91.0<	81
Vauxhall	991	40.5>	165.2>	78
All Small Towns Avg.		34.4	100	86
D. "COMMUNITY FUTURES" ENTITIES				
Crowsnest Pass	6,912	39.7>	85.3<	102
Lac La Biche	-	-	-	-
Wildrose CF	-	-	-	-
Northwestern Regional Economic Development	-	-	-	-
Rural Development Programme # 4†	-	-	-	-

> or < indicates whether figures are above or below provincial average for municipalities of similar size. Source: Residential Property Survey 1987; AMA, nd.

Equalized Assessment Mix: The non-resident proportion of the equalized assessment subject to the school foundation levy administered by Alberta Education

* Indicates municipalities that did not respond.

†This is a regional CED consortium based in Myrnam, Alberta which had not received Community Futures designation.

2 THE ROLE OF THE MUNICIPALITY IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGES SOUGHT

2.1 Assistance to Private Sector

All 28 respondents agree that **a primary role of the municipal corporation** involves **facilitating business development and maintenance.** Facilitate was defined in Question 13.0 of the Survey as "municipal staff only offer advice and make local businesses aware of sources of funding, etc.".

Variance was evident regarding **additional or alternative roles** for municipal corporations in economic development. More than half (17) of the municipalities have provided grants for community recreation projects. Slightly over one third (11) also provided loans for recreation projects. Nine (9) of the 28 respondents reported their municipalities participating as full partners in economic development projects; four of these were cities.

Nearly two thirds (18) of the municipalities rated having a council member sit on the chamber of commerce as a successful method of aiding existing businesses. Less success was experienced if the council-business relationship was performed through a more informal "liaison." Interestingly, however, **although the "facilitator to business" role is carried on by all of the municipal corporations, only half of them (14) report this role as successful or very successful.**

It would be useful to investigate further why the facilitator role is not rated as more successful. Doubtless, legislation assigns this role as the major (if not exclusive) one for municipal corporations involved in CED. Moreover, one hears grumblings about "politics" and political maneuvers that interfere with "business" goals. But such is a rather facile explanation, one that more likely masks community divisions on essential goals or possibly an absence of strong municipal corporation commitment. Whatever the explanations, many of the municipalities could benefit from advice and exchanges of experience on how best to play **a leadership role** and **how to facilitate. Training for municipal leaders** (councillors and corporation managers) would be equally important, especially regarding techniques for managing an on-going CED programme that can involve community participants not necessarily aligned in their viewpoints with local political leadership, or participants who would view CED as much an instrument of social-cultural development as much as business development.

2.2 Methods for Attracting New Business and Industry

The study indicates the **most successful methods** of attracting new enterprises have been "**promotions and advertising**", and "**land banking**." Approximately half and one quarter of the respondents, respectively, rated these two means as being successful. On the other hand, **less than one fifth** of the respondents viewed **tax incentives**, **bonuses** and **grants** as successful (4, 3, 2 municipalities respectively).

While municipalities most commonly act as facilitators to business, and as sources of grants and loans for non-profit groups and community recreation projects, no more than half the respondents believe these to be successful methods of fostering local development. Despite some expressed reservations about the means employed by the municipal corporation in furthering economic development, two-thirds (19)were satisfied with their overall efforts. Still, the same number of respondents also state that the **municipal corporation's role in economic development "could be improved."** When asked in the interview, "what would your municipal corporation do differently if more financial resources were available to you?", the most commonly offered response was "**marketing and promotions.**"

2.3 Changes Desired in the Municipality's Role

When asked how they would like to see the role of the municipality in CED changed, three paramount themes emerged from all categories of municipalities. A "**more active role**" in economic development was the most popular response. An example of this was: "more aggressive in joint ventures and marketing [because] our initiative starts the ball rolling." The second theme expressed -- again, in all categories of municipality -- was a desire to "**market and promote**" the community more effectively. Methods suggested were "advertising" and "attending trade shows". However, a majority of respondents reported a **lack of funds** to carry out these activities. The third theme to emerge is **better planning and goal setting.** This point was corroborated in responses to other questions within the Questionnaire.

The respondents were split (13 to 15), however, on whether economic development should be left to the private sector after the municipal corporation had provided leadership and advice in initiating CED (see Table 2). Surprisingly, **one third** (10) of the respondents believe that municipal corporations should form **venture capital corporations** in partnership with the private sector. **Only five** of the respondents-- one in the city category, four in the towns-- believe the municipal corporation should stay at "**arms length**" from private sector projects.

2.4 Perceived Roles in CED

Municipal corporations would like to continue in their current economic development roles but perform them more aggressively. While marketing and promotional activities at trade shows and in other settings appeal most strongly, few municipalities possess or have allocated the necessary resources -- human as well as financial -- to undertake it. Better planning and goal setting are recognized needs; but here, too, resource limitations have to be recognized--certainly for lesser size communities and for most large towns as well. On the matter of public-private partnerships, there is a polarization of views. Gradations in the form of acceptable partnerships are evident; but virtually everyone agrees that CED requires something more from the municipal corporation than an "arms-length" relationship coupled to a facilitator role.

2.5 Conclusions and Observations: The Capacity of the Municipality To Do Community Economic Development

From our enquiry into roles of the municipality, from findings elsewhere in the Study, and from our observations and interviews about the workings of CED, we draw the conclusion that **Capacity of the Municipalities** is the single most important issue in furthering an understanding of Community Economic Development, and getting it done.

Capacity is an amalgam of leadership; skilled human resources; collective wisdom and strategic thinking in the community; financial resources; local institutions and organizational effectiveness; community wealth; municipal management; and easily accessed decision-making information. Community Capacity pre-conditions the Municipality's success in **visioning the future** and **planning** its economic development initiatives with **strategic effect**. Capacity further determines whether or not a pro-active implementation posture can be taken subsequent to Organization and Planning, and whether it can be sustained over the long term. Decision-making information is the key to visionary as well as practicable plan-making and strategic implementation.

Generally, and in one critical aspect or more-- **the survey respondents in this study appear to be short on capacity.** Few of these organizations--including their municipal corporate partners--appear to have engaged in visioning the future of their community. Planning is most commonly 'programme-opportunistic', seldom comprehensive or strategic. Most CED organizations and their partnered municipal corporations have only a tenuous implementation posture. Financial resources is a common shortfall--and among the 19 towns surveyed.

In most communities, there is a need for **training** leaders, entrepreneurs and CED organizations in the "doing" of economic development in all of its aspects and phases. The objective here should be to move communities **towards self-reliance**--the next stage beyond "Self-Helping".

TABLE 2

INDICATIONS OF PERCEIVED ROLES OF THE MUNICIPALITY IN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Q. 35.0" What Should Be The Role of Your Municipality in Furthering and/or Achieving Economic Development Goals and Objectives?" (Q 35.0) **The Municipality should ...**

Frequency of responses[1]	
(24)	86% - formally approve and adopt an economic development plan or strategy.
(13)	46% - leave it mainly to the business community and business leaders, but provide public leadership and advice.
(10)	36%- form a venture capital corporation in partnership with local and other business corporations.
(9)	32% - become a financial partner in private sector projects and business enterprises when significant or important employment and other community benefits can be expected.
(9)	32% - contribute to economic development projects **only** by providing the normal range of services and infrastructure that a municipality is charged with.
(5)	18% - finance planning studies, consultants and organizational costs, but nothing else.
(5)	18% - keep at "arms length" from any business or industrial venture project even though the project fits well into an approved economic development plan.
(5)	18% - leave the financing of economic development projects entirely to the province.

1) All 28 municipalities signified at least one of the items listed in Q. 35.0.

3 LEGISLATIVE INSTRUMENTS THAT SUPPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES: PERCEIVED ADEQUACY AND CHANGES SOUGHT BY THE MUNICIPALITIES

3.1 The Municipal Government Act -- Bonusing and Incentives

The topic of (formerly) Section 443 of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) was bonusing and incentives. In the minds of local administrators, the repeal of Section 443 raised fundamental questions for the management and success of community economic development activities. Although legal opinions have been offered (e.g., F.A. Laux; 1987), the meaning and intent are still ambiguous for those responding to the survey.

Professor Laux holds the opinion that the repeal of Section 443 was intended to resolve conflicts with other sections of the Municipal Government Act and the Municipal Taxation Act "... in the case of the former Act, to forgive taxes and confer limited exemptions and, in the case of the latter, to provide aid and assistance to non-profit and other organizations whose objective is the enhancement of the interests of the community" (p.240). Laux has concluded that bonusing remains illegal. On the other hand, "interests of the community" can be open to broad and varying interpretation. Archie Grover, Deputy Minister, AMA, stated (**Municipal Counsellor**, Vol. 32 #3): "S. 443 only provided a penalty for doing something that you really shouldn't have been doing anyway"; but "... if a municipality really wants to, it can find legal ways in which to offer incentives to developers."

Most officials interviewed for this study would prefer that firm conclusions on the legality of incentives and bonusing be reached and unambiguous legislation be enacted. This desire for clarification may, however, be "academic". Only a quarter of the municipalities (7) reported having used "tax incentives"-- of which three of them rated the experience as unsuccessful or very unsuccessful. Fewer still (5) reported having applied "bonuses"-- three of whom rated the experience as unsuccessful. And, but for one of the municipalities responding, they are opposed to having bonusing made legal.

The prevailing views expressed by respondents run **against incentives and bonusing**. These reasons were cited:

- small towns will not be able to compete with larger towns; larger towns will be uncompetitive against the cities.
- if the tax revenues are reduced through concessions to new business, then existing businesses and residential ratepayers will end up paying higher taxes.
- business and industries will locate in those communities where it makes sound business sense: in the words of one interviewee: "bribes are unnecessary".

In short, the repeal of Section 443 appears not to have changed the basic policies or behaviour of any of the municipalities surveyed. Policy and practice -- especially in small and large size towns -- appears to recognize common sense reasoning and the empirical findings presented by Butler at the **AMA Exchange** and those of H. Kitchen (see bibliography). In effect, incentives offered for property development are, variously: unnecessary (viable projects will get built anyway); costly to the municipality; or an indifferent factor in the developer's financial calculations.

Nearly two thirds (18) of respondents expressed **general satisfaction** with the powers, freedoms and responsibilities granted to municipal corporations by the **Municipal Government Act.** Dissenters requested changes and clarification on: the ambiguities surrounding the repeal of Section 443 and the restrictions on pricing municipal lands for sale to private interests. The Municipal Government Act allows for **land banking**. Less than half (13) of the respondents reported its use in their municipality; and 5 out of 13 rated this measure as "**unsuccessful**".

3.2 The Municipal Taxation Act

The **Municipal Taxation Act** received approval from almost two thirds (17) of the respondents. Two dissenters from small towns suggested the Municipal Taxation Act be changed so "variable mill rates for various situations" could be employed to allow tax breaks and concessions to industry. Only 4 respondents consider tax incentives to be a successful method for attracting industry.

3.3 The Planning Act

The **Planning Act** is believed to be "satisfactory" by two thirds (19) of the respondents. Several respondents (8) were "uncertain". In interviews, **however**, discussion of the Planning Act elicited several negative comments.

A number of respondents stated that the planning regime in Alberta is "constricted", "bureaucratic" and "overly structured". A few respondents request **more local flexibility for small towns** because "planning should be dependent upon community needs." From interviews, and from responses to the survey, opinions refer to **excessive delay** in obtaining development and subdivision approvals, and **doubts** about whether input from the municipality is seriously considered by the Planning Board. **Notwithstanding, no one volunteered any direct causal links between planning machinery and their lack of success in economic development projects or initiatives.**

3.4 The Role of the Regional Planning Commission

Should the Regional Planning Commissions (RPC's) be more engaged in economic development? A majority of the nine administrators interviewed in the study expressed trepidation about the RPC's delving into CED activities. Concern was expressed that the RPC's tend to make "political" decisions biased in favour of their largest urban centre(s).

One interviewee perceives that RPC's are instruments of the provincial government and therefore duty bound to implement provincial policies not always in sympathy with local economic development aspirations or plans. Another official expressed concern that, if the RPC's engage in economic development planning and related initiatives, municipal autonomy would be undermined. Another ventured the opinion that the RPC's are poorly equipped to perform economic development functions.

One interviewee, however, welcomes the entry of the RPC's into the economic development field, for reasons similar to those expressed by Tom Baldwin (1988, see bibliography). Baldwin (as did our informant) notes that the key link between general municipal planning and economic development planning is land; "Location, services, roads and supply all are land-related factors ... that makes communications between a municipality's community planning role and its economic development role so vital."

Indisputable though Baldwin's point is, it substantiates only an argument that the two forms of planning need to be coordinated; not that land use planning agencies need necessarily become economic development agents.

3.5 Observations and Conclusions

First, bonusing and incentives for property development is considered at best an insignificant means for implementing local economic development plans. Local officials need to be made more aware of this, and to be informed of AMA's studies in this area (see bibliography for examples).

Second, the fear of small communities that provincial permissiveness in the matter of bonusing and incentives makes them "uncompetitive" against larger municipalities ought to be dispelled. Unambiguous legislation could be one step to take. At the same time, it should be recognized there are other, more significant factors than property tax incentives that inhibit or handicap economic development initiatives in the smaller towns and cities.

Third, local sensitivity about RPC's engaging in economic development should be addressed. Both theory and current provincial policy suggest CED succeeds when it flows from community-based commitment and initiatives, and from community-based visioning of the future. In our view the introduction of 'supra-agencies' for planning and policy-making can be counter-productive to CED. Supra-agencies who are empowered only to plan and prescribe courses of action but who have no buy-in to implementation cannot be effective CED agents. On the other hand, there are roles conceivable for the RPC's--for example: maintaining data and information files; performing objective analyses of local economic and social conditions; designing physical environment improvements consistent with a community's economic development strategy; and the provision of capacity-building grants, especially in the smaller municipalities. But, here too, we suspect that RPC's in general lack the capacity at present (especially in "design").

Fourth, most municipal CAO's and economic development officers hold the matter of **land use planning** -- and improvements to the physical environment in general -- as separate operations from economic development planning. There is little evidence of an integrated perspective being applied to these two planning responsibilities. This is most likely explained by the fact that Regional Planning Commissions prepare and administer Official Plans -- usually in localities well removed from the municipality -- while community organizations (for the general case) do economic development planning. In our view, CED plans and initiatives should "drive", not tag onto, the process of preparing and of periodically adjusting official land use plans in the municipality. For successful economic development, the municipality must shift from purely land use planning services and regulation to environment project designs (civic embellishments) and corporate management. These latter areas of service present a challenge to the RPCs that is presently unmet.

4 MUNICIPALITIES' OUTLOOK AND THE PRESENT STATE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

4.1 Current Outlooks on the Future

In Question 32.0, respondents were asked, "Considering the present direction and strength of economic development in your municipality, is your view of the future **pessimistic or optimistic**?" It will be noted that this question seeks an opinion founded on perceptions of the community's ability or **capacities** to achieve desired ends. Question 33.0 followed up by asking what are the "**issues** in community economic development that your community has to deal with?" Then, Question 34.0 asked, "...is it likely your municipality will be able to solve the issues without provincial government aid?"

These three queries together had as one of the purposes to elicit indirectly some indicators of the **community's capacities** (implicitly, including those of the municipal corporation) to undertake CED under its own steam (viz. self help, self reliance).

Notwithstanding that 93% (26) of the respondents replied "**optimistic**", an interesting array of perceived issues emerged from Question 33.0. And, of the 26 respondents who chose to answer Q. 34.0, **20 (71% of all survey respondents) state their problems cannot be solved without provincial aid.**

4.2 Major Issues in Dealing with CED (Q33.0 and 34.0)

Respondents were requested to list the **three major issues** in their economic development efforts (Q.33.0). For the economic development organizations and municipalities grouped together in the **Community Futures category** of the survey sample, major issues are: 1) Social and Community Development, and 2) Economic Diversification. **Population decline** was the most frequent social -development issue reported. Others reported relate to: "low native participation in the workforce"; a "need for hospitality training"; a desire for "community beautification"; and concerns about "poor labour relations." "Economic diversification" had fewer mentions; these focussed on "attracting new industry (and businesses)."

Responses from the surveyed **cities** can be grouped into: 1) Industrial Diversification and Attraction; 2) Local Business Development; and 3) Social Development (see Table 3). The first of these included "lessening dependence upon the oil industry"; "attracting industrial development"; "developing and marketing products and technology that are independent of transportation and factory

site locations"; and "developing a larger tourism industry". Regarding "local business development", issues are: "downtown revitalization"; "assistance to local business"; and "creating local employment opportunities". "Social development" issues mentioned were "increasing community involvement" and fostering a "positive community attitude". Generally speaking, the economic development issue for the cities surveyed is attraction of new industry as a method of diversifying the local economy. Social issues mentioned did not (surprisingly) touch on training or re-training of the workforce or special needs of youth.

For the **Large Town** category, issues fall into two areas: 1) Development and Promotion of Existing Business and 2) Planning. For the first of these: "promote the town area and hospitality resources"; "expand agribusiness"; and "become more proactive in seeking development opportunities". The frequent mention of a need for planning need speaks for itself. It is usually coupled to a perceived need to get "all concerned parties" involved. We would note that within these larger towns, it is apparent that the necessary and sufficient personnel, knowledge, experience and skills are not yet present to perform economic development planning and implementation with full or sustained effectiveness. It is noteworthy, too, that the larger towns are generally concerned with expanding existing businesses more than attracting new industry or creating new enterprises from local resources.

In the , **Small Towns** (up to 5000 population), issues were expressed and articulated more concisely and, in some respects, differently than by any of the preceding three categories. Three major groupings emerged: 1) Social and Infrastructure Development; 2) Business Revitalization and Diversification; and 3) Funding for Economic Development Planning and Personnel. Social and infrastructure improvements are related to sewer, highway and physical improvements to the downtown, as well as to recreation, social development and community recreation projects. In general, issues in this category revolve around creating "**a better physical environment**"--presumably as a means for furthering economic development goals.

Regarding business revitalization and diversification, small town respondents listed issues similar to those in the "large towns": the creation of a "better business environment"; "downtown revitalization"; "diversification"; and "tourism development". The smaller towns further indicated greater concern for retention of existing businesses than did the other Survey respondents.

Regarding funding and personnel for economic development planning, respondents tended to emphasize "hiring economic development officers" and obtaining "funding for economic development activities". **The small towns group is distinctly more concerned than the other groups with funding for initiatives and personnel**. This is hardly surprising. Small towns have

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR ISSUES, OBSTACLES AND BARRIERS REPORTED BY THE RESPONDENTS[1]

Q33: "What do you see as the one, two, or three major issues in community economic development that your community has to deal with?"
Q12: "What local obstacles and barriers exist in the pursuit of your economic development objectives?"

	SURVEY RESPONDENTS			
	Cities (n=6)	Large Towns (n=9)	Small Towns (n=8)	Community Futures Entities[2] (n=5)
Major Issues (Q33.0)				
o Social/Community Development	X		X	X
o Planning and Personnel		X	X	
o Economic Diversification	X			X
o Local Business Development and Revitalization	X	X		
o Infrastructure Development			X	
Obstacles and Barriers (Q12.0)				
o Lack of Financial Resources/ Funding for Planning or Implementation OF CED	X	X	X	X
o Capacity: organization, planning, personnel		X	X	X
o Distance from Major Centres		X	X	X
o Planning and Goal-Setting		X	X	

(1) Questions 33.0 and 12.0 provided an open-ended, write-in response. The themes in this Table are the author's summation and categorization of all the responses. "X" indicates the themes most often mentioned by the respondents.
(2) Four are constituted by a grouping of several municipalities, some of which are urban and the others rural; one of the Community Futures entities is constituted by a single municipality (Crowsnest Pass).

significantly fewer human resources--skilled or otherwise--to begin with than do the larger municipalities. Issues of **organization** expressed by survey respondents included: (we must) "determine a role for the municipal corporation" and (how to) "involve the chamber of commerce".

Other indicators of Community Capacity for performing economic development were cited. All of the 28 municipalities reported they had an economic development committee in place. However, only 33% have the resources or the programme requirement to employ an economic development officer, while 19% employ a part-time officer. About 1 in 4 of the municipalities have had a position established for about 7 years or longer; 1 in 5 have had positions established for only 36 months or less. Of the surveyed municipalities, 50% report having employed consultants in their CED programme.

The more remote the municipality from the centre of the province, the more telling the comments offered. For example: "in our area of high unemployment and high business failures, there is a strong reluctance of investors... we need **loan guarantees** for prospective enterprises in order to compete; "transportation costs for agricultural products (are prohibitive)"; "**programmes and policies focus on Calgary and Edmonton too much**"; "infrastructure needs".

There are clearly two aspects to the appeal for provincial aid and/or greater sympathy and concern. One centres on the matter of regional imbalances, factors of remoteness and underdevelopment. Apparently, **CED in its present conception and its support system--is not an entirely adequate tool**. The other aspect refers to **funding in CED operations**. Most of the surveyed communities state they are strapped for financial resources--at best, they might keep an economic development officer employed, but even then, his/her capacities to plan, manage, carry out strategic or market studies, promote and conclude deals are infirm. Detailed comparison of financial capacities between CED organizations in the small cities, and towns would likely reinforce the view that size and remoteness from major markets places Alberta's towns very weakly in the competitive environment of development.

4.3 Major Obstacles and Barriers to Doing CED (Q12.0)

Respondents were asked to identify the **obstacles and barriers** to their efforts in CED (Q 12.0). The major, recurrent theme is **a lack of funding**-- with some variations on where the respondents believe this barrier lies. Except for the cities, another problem **common** to all groups cited was **location and distance from markets**.

The major issues and barriers noted by the four "**Community Futures" entities** related: to the

delivery of provincial programmes; a need for more effective planning and goal selection; and insufficient funding for economic development programmes. Provincial programmes were described as taking a "piecemeal approach" and having "too many strings" attached. Because of limited finances, effective planning and implementation were impaired. Also, staffing was sorely limited for the same reasons.

The **cities** listed lack of funding as their major constraint. The **large towns** viewed their own lack of capacity and financial resources as a major obstacle. Other obstacles were listed were "lack of goals and objectives"; "an unwillingness to commit effort to develop comprehensive plans"; and a "lack of coordination". It would appear that the purely volunteeristic model of CED that now operates is shaky.

Small towns listed obstacles and barriers similar to large towns. By far the greatest number of obstacles relate to a lack of community resources--financial and human--available for organization and planning--"no leadership"; "no economic development coordinator"; "no workers"; "everyone expects the municipality to do and finance it all"; "(no) time and resources to carry out the programs of economic development"; and (too little) "local support and awareness". Other obstacles and barriers listed were a lack of financial resources and the problems of small towns trying to compete with larger centres for new enterprises. Some or these centres also recognize explicitly the link between their relatively small populations and organizational and planning impediments.

4.4 Conclusions and Observations

Table 3 summarizes where the emphases are placed by each of the sample categories in respect of "obstacles and barriers". Clearly, **the towns emphasize their problems of capacity**--leadership, skilled personnel, finance, etc. Are the capacity constraints cited realistic? If they are, what implications do these findings have for the success of the "self-help" policy that underlines the delivery of provincial programmes?

Both a priori and the history of community development in Canada point to a general lack of capacity in small communities when it comes to addressing critical development (or "survival") issues. Moreover, the terms or requirements for engaging in community economic development in a meaningful sense these days are such as to demand the kinds of knowledge and information bases, organizational wisdom and informed people skilled in business thinking, planning or conceptual thinking, and "working the system" that small communities do not commonly possess. This is as true--or truer--of the municipal corporation as it is of the community at large. Elsewhere than in the cities, municipal administrators have a hard time simply **managing** well their traditional

complement of services. They seldom plan or think far ahead. Indeed, others plan for them--as, for example, in land use, and in financial grants. Small communities are, generally speaking, accustomed to managing and responding to events or demands, not leading events. Moreover, by tradition, and to a degree, by statute, municipal councils are not expected to be opportunistic or visionary--they are expected to only "administer".

Therefore, to the extent that CED calls upon the capacities we refer to above, the findings of the Survey appear to us to be "realistic". It may, however be argued that some towns in Alberta have the financial capacity to engage in CED--indeed, a number of them have invested considerably in supporting CED operations. But one cannot readily assume that for the general case, the towns can afford either to sustain their present efforts or to increase their expenditures in order to have regular paid personnel lead the work of community economic development. As we note elsewhere, voluntary efforts cannot best carry--or, at least sustain--a meaningful CED role. Continuity, resources and leadership should, we believe, be provided at the level of the municipal corporation-- although without compromising broad community input and support for CED.

Two additional points need to be made. The cities in Alberta demonstrably have the capacity to carry a CED function under their own steam. From the perspective of small communities, who see the larger municipalities as already disproportionately favoured in grants (for all purposes), and in the availability of provincial expert assistance, the position of the cities can appear inequitable. Second, if "self help" is arguable on the basis that most towns/communities have the "raw material"--all they have to do is mobilize it, it is nonetheless the case that a need exists for training and education to build community awareness and to shape or enhance local capacities. In other words, there is a need for **provincial aid to better enable "self-help"**, to help the small communities reach a certain threshold of capacity which they have not yet reached. At the moment, advice and consulting services provided by provincial officials to the small towns appear to be thinly spread and limited in scope. Under the best of conditions, they do not translate into local commitment and capacity to follow through.

Basic skills, talents, entrepreneurial ability, and community commitment need to be developed and nourished by more substantial means than those currently perceived by the municipalities to be available.

For the towns, more effective local economic development can be fostered by concentrating on training, expertise and entrepreneurship. This should, of course, be done in any action or project context. For the cities and certain towns, where skill shortages are less of a problem, the provincial "self-help" approach in its present state is acceptable.

5 KEY ALBERTA PROGRAMMES FOR COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: PERCEIVED ADEQUACY AND CHANGES SOUGHT BY MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED

5.1 Views and Opinions on the Package of Programmes and Their Workings

The respondents to Question 25.0 tend to hold disquieting views regarding the province's policies and programmes for local economic development. To begin with, **only 40% (11) regard the present "package" of provincial programmes as "good enough" in helping accomplish local economic development goals and objectives.** Approximately **36%** (10) of the respondents believe the current package is "**poorly suited**". The remainder of the respondents (7) had no opinions. What reliability can be given to these responses?

The length of time that a community has employed an economic development coordinator can be one indicator of reliability; the assumption being that length of experience and therefore good familiarity with the workings of programmes provides a basis for judgement. In the case of the Community Futures entities, all of them have employed coordinators for more than 7 years (Q 2.2). Only one of the respondents states that the programme package is "good enough"; the remaining 4 respondents state they are "poorly suited" to achieving local economic development.

Among cities and towns respondents, just over half of them (13 of 23) have employed economic development coordinators. Only one of these municipalities have maintained a coordinator for 7 or more years. Most of the others who reported stated a range from 3 years to 5 months.

For the 10 remaining respondents who are dissatisfied with the provincial package, 5 of these municipalities had Equalized Assessment Mixes **superior** to both the sample average and the provincial average for towns of comparable size (see Table 1). From this, it can be inferred that their opinions are not merely the symptoms of municipal corporations with inadequate non-residential tax bases or those who could find no satisfaction in provincial programmes. Among the 5 dissatisfied respondents whose Equalized Assessments Mixes are lower than the averages for towns of similar size, 2 were cities, while the others were from the small town category.

Respondents were asked to qualify their views about the design, communication, coordination, etc., of provincial programmes by checking-off whether they agreed or disagreed with nine (9) descriptive sentences provided to them (Q. 27.0). All 28 respondents checked off at least one. Table 4 shows the five most-frequently selected descriptions.

TABLE 4

RESPONDENT'S VIEWS ABOUT SELECTED ASPECTS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES[1]

Q. 27.0 Considering the range of provincial programmes available to assist economic development in your community that you are aware of, please indicate your feelings about them. Circle the appropriate word or phrase in the parenthesis to express your opinions.

(#) % Respondents who **disagreed** with the statement	(#) % Respondents who **agreed** with the statement[2]	Statement
(3) 13%	(20) 87%	programmes do tend to focus too much on the larger municipalities;
(4) 18%	(18) 82%	programmes do not tend to treat all sized municipalities equally, irrespective of their size;
(3) 15%	(17) 85%	programmes do demand too much "red tape" and "administrative hassle" to be worth applying for;
(6) 30%	(14) 70%	programmes are not well explained and communicated;
(7) 35%	(13) 65%	there is not good coordination among and between programmes.

1) Question 27.0 provided a list of 9 aspects, to be qualified in a positive or negative way by the respondent. Only those aspects having a response frequency of 20 or greater are reported in the table. Frequencies on the 4 aspects not reported here varied between 16 and 18, with opinions generally "split".

2) The number of respondents who checked off at least one of the aspects on the list of 9 provided in the question was 28.

Sixty (60%) to seventy percent of respondents in the 28 respondent survey believe that programmes **focus too-much on the larger municipalities and/or discriminate against the smaller ones**. In addition, most respondents (17 of 28) believe **programmes demand too much red tape.** Just under half of them feel **there is not good coordination among and between programmes.**

On the matter of poor coordination, one interviewee stated: "It seems higher levels of government throw out programmes without policies." Several of the municipalities that depend upon agriculture for their economic base are especially unhappy about the lack of coordination and cooperation between Alberta Agriculture and Economic Development and Trade. Another town official criticizes provincial programmes for "...skewing a community's agenda" by offering money as an incentive to encourage municipal participation in provincial programmes and then later shifting the financial burden to the municipality. The interviewed official noted that his municipal corporation would likely never have become involved in that particular area except for the financial inducement provided by the provincial government.

In interviews, references were made to the cuts in funding to rural development projects. As well, resentment was expressed regarding the concentration of economic development counselling services in the larger urban centres, the impression being that the larger centres have advantages in advancing CED objectives. Interviewees also assert that high-tech and foreign **investment projects are regularly steered towards Calgary and Edmonton**--not merely as a matter of un-governed practice, but as **a matter of provincial policy**.

5.2 Changes Desired in Provincial Programmes

Respondents were given an opportunity to suggest up to three "**most important changes**" to provincial programmes or legislation that they would like to see (Q. 26.0). These are summarized in **Table 5**. Respondents in the **Community Futures** category, were the least satisfied with the provincial package and also offer the most extensive list of "needed changes". Their list embraces: 1) financial and technical aid for economic development planning; and 2) policy and programme changes to bring about rural economic diversification.

TABLE 5

CHANGES DESIRED TO PROVINCIAL PROGRAMMES[1]

Q26.0: "What are the most important changes to provincial policies, programmes or legislation that you would like to see?"

	SURVEY RESPONDENTS			
	Cities (N=6)	**Large Towns** (N=9)	**Small Towns** (N=8)	**Community Futures Entities**[2] (N=5)
Changes Desired				
o Policies: rural economic diversification; incentives to needy regions; decentralization of services and industries	X	X		X
o Incentives/Financing for Business	X		X	
o Attitude of 'central' officials	X			
o Financial/Technical Aid for CED Planning, Promotions				X
o Aid for Physical Infrastructure Developments			X	

(1) Question 26.0 provided an open-ended, write-in response. The phrases in this Table are the author's summation and categorization of all the responses. "X" indicates the themes most often mentioned by the respondents.

(2) Four are constituted by a grouping of several municipalities, some of which are urban and the others rural; one of the Community Futures entities is constituted by a single municipality (Crowsnest Pass).

Specific suggestions included: "revenue sharing"; "financial assistance for economic development planning"; "help with promo materials"; "more than a single year of funding for economic development programmes"; "subsidized freight and transportation rates"; "more incentives to (have business/industry) locate in rural Alberta"; improved "rural services" and "quality of life"; and having existing programmes delivery "pay more attention to physical distances rather than simply per-capita" criteria.

From the **cities** respondents, suggestions can be grouped into: 1) policy; 2) finance; and 3) attitude. Under policy, it was suggested that all three levels of government "develop a coordinated (economic development) strategy"; that the province should better "address regional disparity in handling provincial incentives"; and that "market forces (be allowed) to determine (the) locations of high-tech and research establishments". In finance, better "small business financing" was suggested. Finally, it was suggested that provincial officials abandon their "we know what's best for the province" attitude.

The **large towns** respondents offered relatively few **programmes changes**. These were: "more evenly distributed treatment"; the province provide to industry "incentives and bonuses where needed"; a "decentralization of government services beyond metropolitan Edmonton and Calgary".

The **small towns** respondents voiced two types of suggestions: 1) incentives for business, and 2) physical infrastructure development. Regarding incentives: "as a condition of receiving grants, companies ... should be directed to ... economically lacking areas"; "the province should adopt a scheme ... where each business enterprise that creates a job" is eligible for grants; "public sector (loan) guarantees for smaller projects"; and "small communities need additional incentives to attract and retain business". In a related area, one respondent stated "the waiver of taxes should never be allowed". From the infrastructure category: "more assistance to upgrade existing infrastructure in servicing ... industrial parks"; and "more adequate grants to infrastructure, water, sewer, roads, sewage treatment facilities, and water treatment plants". **The towns are clearly concerned with the adequacy of provincial incentives to attract business and industry to rural Alberta. They view provincial aid in physical environment improvements and infrastructure development as necessary to improve the local quality of life and to attract investors in new enterprises.**

All four of the sample groups tended to suggest a new programme emphasis on **rural economic diversification**. The Community Futures group emphatically requested policies and programmes directed to aiding communities in **performing economic development planning**. The cities respondents may have been less concerned with more aid for economic development planning because

they have experienced personnel and financial resources to manage effective programmes. The towns may have shown less interest in/assistance to planning because their limited experience in development activities has not yet indicated to them their limited capacity to act effectively in this area.

5.3 Conclusions and Observations

First, no generalizations about desired changes to provincial policies and programmes can be made, although some differences in emphasis between the groups of respondents about broadly defined types of desired change can be discerned (see Table 5). These differing emphases would suggest only that further enquiry and/or responses to the views expressed that might be contemplated ought to be "municipality size specific". Second, many of the expressed desires for change, in all categories of the sample, amount to appeals for more aid--typically financial--from the province. Few stated desired changes constitute major alterations to the economic development programmes, policies, or legislation now in place. How urgently these desired changes are seen to be by the respondents or how reasonable they are in light of the general fiscal need of the municipalities, we are not in a position to judge (nor was it the task of the survey to ascertain).

Third, the particular types of change (or help) sought by the small towns is not unexpected. They would like to be able to attract more enterprises and business establishments. They view business incentives and aid to physical infrastructure development as the keys. But their expectations of success from deploying these means--for the general case--is not supported by experience in CED.

6 FACTORS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES' APPRECIATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMMES

6.1 Advisory Services and Communications

For provincial programmes to be effective, they must, in the first instance, be well communicated. Municipal leaders should be aware of programme opportunities, eligibility criteria and the terms of programme delivery and potential benefits. Our Questionnaire attempted to assess the state of communication in general with specific reference to the scope of economic development programmes available and awareness of them (Q's 27, 28 , 29, and 30). These responses could be viewed as a gauge of the effectiveness of the grants book (*1987 Municipal Assistance Programs: Working Together, Growing Together*) which assembles such information annually for the benefit of municipal councils and administrators.

About half of the respondents have sought advice on economic development matters at least "a few times" from officials in their region or in Edmonton. Eighty-six percent (24) of them report they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the advice -- an impressively high and encouraging figure; while 82% of respondents (23) were satisfied with the "services and assistance" provided. These findings compare favourably with the fact that 68% (19) of respondents believe "the quality and effectiveness of communication" between municipalities and provincial departments is "good" or "very good".

However appreciative they were of communications and advisory services generally, half (14) of the respondents stated that economic programmes are **"not well explained and communicated"** (Q. 27.0, see table 4). The specifics and operational details although available, are not perceived to be well explained or effectively communicated. A further indicator of the state of communication can be found in the fact that 8 out 19 respondents to Question 31.0 **were aware of only three or fewer of economic development programmes.** Only a handful of them were aware of more than 10.

6.2 Design and Delivery of Programmes

Regarding the programmes themselves, the respondents divide evenly (11-9) on whether "programmes are well designed and administered". Close to half (13) of the respondents felt there is **poor coordination** among and between programmes.

6.3 Conclusions and Observations

In general, municipalities are not sufficiently aware of the existence of many economic development programme opportunities offered by senior governments. A detailed understanding of programmes at the municipal level appears to be wanting. A significant proportion of respondents perceive programmes coordination (and interdepartmental communication) to be poor.

On the other hand, the existence of programmes and grants are published annually by AMA and distributed to municipalities. It is conceivable that municipal administrators by and large do not familiarize themselves with this information because of their preoccupations with day to day management of the corporation. It is further conceivable that municipal administrators do not feel a need to familiarize themselves with the full range and scope of provincial programmes because they themselves are not typically charged with leading or managing CED activities. Committees and economic development officers do, however,and one might suppose one of their principle functions is to keep abreast of opportunities. The impression gained from this survey is that not all of them do and/or that provincial communications are not as effective as they might be. We believe it is in the interest of both municipalities and provincial departments that the explanation be sought.

7 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER AMA ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES

7.1 Limited Responses

What are the areas of advice, assistance or information services that AMA should be offering relative to the municipality's role in CED? Only half of the respondents checked-off one or more of the eight topics listed in section G of the Questionnaire. This low-level of response could well reflect the tail-end positioning of this item in the Questionnaire. The findings should therefore be viewed as preliminary only.

"**Legal Advice**" and "**A List of Funding Programmes**" were the most frequently mentioned needs. Suggestions regarding funding programmes included: "comprehensive listing followed by updates"; "be selective"; clear away the "nightmare" of information for small business and community programmes; "brochures that state pros and cons"; "explain how to access" programmes; "updates on actual funds remaining and available for programmes".

There was a modest mention of "**Interpretative Bulletins**", "**Information Bulletins**" and "**Seminars and Courses**". Here, expressions of need were: frequent "updates on programmes"; guidance on relevant programmes and legislation; "closer ties to Economic Developers Association"; "tie into the University of Waterloo economic development training programme"; seminars on "provincial programmes"; and "role training for economic development officers".

"**Comparative Statistics**" had virtually no appeal for respondents in the cities category and only a few confirmations from other respondents. Comments included: "better and wider range of statistics"; "computerized statistics"; specially aggregated statistics for economic development regions; "provide current and more detailed statistics"."**Municipal Administrative Handbook (Inserts)**" and "**Advisory Services**" received only a couple of acknowledgements.

7.2 Conclusions and Observations

While a number of suggestions were made, the low response rate on section G of the Questionnaire would suggest that further exploration by AMA officials is desirable. On the other hand, the check-offs and comments made by the 13 respondents confirms findings elsewhere in this study about communication and capacity for doing CED. Improved **communications, information flow**, and **training** in CED are emerging preoccupations among municipal administrators These items should be seen as key elements in any endeavours by AMA and other departments to assist capacity building for municipal corporations and their partnered community organizations.

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

"Facts and Opinions at the Municipal Corporate Level"

Designed and Administered by the
Urban and Regional Research Laboratory,
Faculty of Environmental Design,
The University of Calgary.

February - April 1988

Thank-you for your co-operation in completing this Questionnaire. The Questionnaire must be completed by the senior administrative officer of the Municipality individually or with the mayor. It will take approximately one hour to complete.

When you have filled out the questionnaire, place it in the self addressed envelope provided, and return it before March 14, 1988.

If you require any assistance or clarification, contact either Neil Mac Donald (220-6811) or Professor William Perks (220-4777).

Municipality: _____

A. This first section deals with the form and approach of your local community economic development efforts. Please circle the appropriate responses as they apply to your municipality.

1.0 Is there an economic development committee of municipal council or something similar set up in your community? Yes No

If you answered yes, go to question 2.0.

1.1 If you answered no to question 1.0, can you tell us why your municipal corporation has not set up an economic development committee?

___No interest ___Healthy local economy ___Other (Please specify)_____

_____

2.0 Does the Municipal Corporation or some other group such as an economic development committee in your community employ an economic development co-ordinator? Yes No

If you answered no, go to question 3.0

2.1 If you answered yes to question 2.0, is this position full or part-time?

Full-time Part-time

2.2 How long has this position existed?

_____ Months

3.0 How would you describe the decision-making process in your local municipal economic development efforts? (A) Decisions are made by administrators in a "top down" manner or (B) Consensus is sought from affected parties. Please circle "A" or "B" or provide a description of your decision-making process _____

_____

_____

3.1 Have consultants been employed at any time to work in the community economic development area? Yes No

If you answered no, go to question 4.0

3.2 Were you satisfied with their services? Yes No

4.0 Has your community produced an economic development plan of some type? Yes No

If you answered no, go to question 5.0

4.1 Were these community economic development plans implemented? (Circle one)

Fully implemented Partially implemented Not implemented at all

If you answered "not implemented at all," go to question 5.0

4.2 Is the plan reviewed and updated? Yes No

4.3 If you answered either "fully implemented" or "partially implemented" in question 4.2, how would you rate your success in implementation? Please circle the phrase that best completes the sentence. "Goals and objectives ... are achieved "

completely to some extent only a little hardly at all

If you indicated " completely" or "to some extent," go to question 4.5

4.4 If you indicated "only a little" or "hardly at all" in question 4.3, can you tell us what factors or events would explain the situation? Please state only the most important three 1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

4.5 Are the residents of your community aware of and committed to the community economic development plan? Circle the appropriate response

most are some are few are generally not aware

5.0 Are your community economic development plans and programmes co-ordinated with other local planning bodies or interest groups in the municipality, such as the Chamber of Commerce, business associations or interest groups etc.? Please indicate how many committees, bodies, and interest groups you co-ordinate with.

(___ groups) ___ None ___ Don't Know

6.0 Do you co-ordinate community economic development efforts with neighboring political bodies such as municipal districts, improvement districts, towns, villages, or cities, etc.? Please indicate the number of political organizations outside your community you co-ordinate your economic development efforts with.

(___groups) ___ None ___ Don't Know

7.0 How would you describe the level of co-operation between your community economic development committee and these other non-local bodies? Please circle the description that represents the level of co-operation.

Complete co-operation Some co-operation Little co-operation No Co-operation

8.0 How are your community economic development efforts financed? Please check as many as apply.

___Special tax.
___General revenues of the municipality.
___Municipal Affairs direct or indirect grants.
___Other provincial funding.
___Federal funding.
___Other (Please specify) _____

9.0 Is the current expenditure sufficient for your Municipality to pursue its economic development goals and objectives effectively? Yes No No Opinion

10.0 How much has the Municipality spent on Economic Development planning or

operating programmes or projects for the fiscal years shown? Approximate amounts or estimates are satisfactory.

Fiscal Year	$ From municipal funds	$ From other sources
1988 Budget	_____	_____
1987 Actual	_____	_____
1986 Actual	_____	_____
1985 Actual	_____	_____

11.0 Overall, how satisfied are you with your community economic development efforts? Please circle the words that best describe your level of satisfaction

Extremely satisfied Satisfied Dissatisfied Extremely dissatisfied

12.0 What local obstacles and barriers exist in the pursuit of your community economic development objectives? Please describe the most important one or two

1 _____
2 _____

B. This section addresses the role of the Municipal Corporation in community economic development efforts.

13.0 The options below are ones that Municipal Corporations customarily use to assist the private sector in achieving economic development objectives. What is the current practice or policy of your Municipal Corporation on the question of assisting the private sector in achieving community economic development goals and objectives? Please check-off as many of the descriptions that apply to your municipality

___ Facilitator (Municipal staff only offer advice and make local businesses aware of sources of funding, etc.)
___ Lender of last resort (For community recreation projects)
___ Source of grants (For non profit community organizations, etc.)

___ Source of venture capital (For community recreation projects)
___ Full partner (Land banking and development)
___ Other _____

14.0 Please complete the following sentence by circling the phrase that best describes your opinion "The role played by our Municipal Corporation in furthering economic objectives of the community..."

is just right could be improved should be changed is very inadequate

If you answered "is just right" please go to question 16.0.

15.0 How would you like to see the role the Municipal Corporation plays in community economic development changed? _____

_____

_____

16.0 What methods does your Municipal Corporation use to aid existing businesses in the community? Please check-off the methods and how successful they are.

	Very successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
1 Mayor and Council Meet with Business representatives regularly.	___	___	___	___
2 Council representative sits on the Chamber of Commerce	___	___	___	___
3 Municipal Corporation acts as a facilitator for local business development	___	___	___	___
4 Other (and its success): _____				

17.0 What methods does your municipality employ to attract new business and

industry to the community? Please check off the methods that you use and how successful they are. If you do not use the method, leave it blank.

	Very successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very unsuccessful
1 Promotions / advertising	___	___	___	___
2 Tax incentives or deferments	___	___	___	___
3 Bonuses	___	___	___	___
4 Grants	___	___	___	___
5 Land Banking	___	___	___	___
6 Other (and its success): _____				

C. This section asks about provincial legislation, policies and programmes, and your opinions on their effectiveness and benefit to the municipality. Please circle the appropriate response unless instructed to do otherwise.

18.0 When considering community economic development efforts, how often do you consult provincial legislation such as the Municipal Government Act, the Planning Act or the Municipal Taxation Act?

Frequently Sometimes Never

19.0 For the role that your Municipal Corporation would like to play in community economic development, does the Municipal Act provide you with a satisfactory set of powers, responsibilities and freedoms to do the job? Yes No Uncertain

If you answered yes, please go to question 21.0

20.0 How would you alter or modify the Municipal Act to enable you to better play a role in community economic development? _____

_____

_____

21.0 For the role that your Municipal Corporation would like to play in community economic development, does the **Planning Act** provide you with a satisfactory set of powers, responsibilities and freedoms to do the job? Yes No Uncertain

If you answered yes, go to question 23.0.

22.0 How would you alter or modify the **Planning Act** to enable you to better play a role in community economic development?_____

_____

_____

23.0 For the role that your Municipal Corporation would like to play in community economic development, does the **Municipal Taxation Act** provide you with a satisfactory set of powers, responsibilities and freedoms to do the job? Yes No Uncertain

If you answered yes, go to question 25.0.

24.0 How would you alter or modify the **Municipal Taxation Act** to enable you to better play a role in community economic development?_____

_____

_____

25.0 Do you believe that the present "package" of provincial government policies, programmes and legislation are suited to encouraging and helping accomplish economic development goals in your community?

Well suited Good enough Poorly suited Don't know

26.0 What are the **most important** changes to provincial policies, programmes or legislation that you would like to see. **(Do not list more than three)**

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

27.0 Considering the range of provincial programmes available to assist economic development in your community that you are aware of, please indicate your feelings about them. Circle the appropriate word or phrase in the parenthesis to express your opinions.

- generally, programmes (are, are not) well designed and administered
- there (is, is not) good co-ordination among and between programmes
- generally, programmes (do, do not) overlap and cover the same areas
- programmes are O.K., but we (have, have not) been successful in applications
- programmes (do, do not) promise more than they can deliver
- programmes (do, do not) demand too much "red tape" and "administrative hassle" to be worthwhile applying for
- programmes (are, are not) well explained and communicated
- programmes (do, do not) tend to focus too much on the larger municipalities
- programmes (do, do not) tend to treat all sized municipalities equally, irrespective of their size.

Further opinions, if you wish _____

_____

28.0 Provincial department officials in your region and in Edmonton are available to advise and provide services to a municipality that is thinking about or engaged in doing an economic development plan or some kind of development project.

a) How often would you say your municipality have sought advice from provincial officials regarding economic development matters?

Never A few times Often

b) How satisfied were you with the advice?

Very satisfied Generally satisfied Dissatisfied Not applicable

c) If you indicated "dissatisfied," please explain_____

_____

_____

d) How satisfied were you with the services or assistance provided to you

Very satisfied Generally satisfied Dissatisfied Not applicable

e) If you indicated "dissatisfied," please explain_____

_____

_____

29.0 Are there areas of community economic development that you would like assistance with, but for which no provincial programme exists? Yes No

If you answered "no", go to question 30.0.

29.1 If you answered yes in question 29.0, please describe these areas _____

_____

_____

30.0 How would you describe the quality and effectiveness of communication between your municipality and provincial departments with regard to provincial economic development policies and programmes?

Very good Good Poor Very poor

31.0 As you probably know, there are many provincial and federal programmes that can be applied for to assist local economic development in one way or another. How many such programmes are you aware of? Please indicate the number ____

E. In this section we are interested in your views about "community economic development" and the future of your community.

32.0 Considering the present direction and strength of economic development in your municipality, is your view of the future (A) pessimistic or (B) optimistic?

Circle A or B. Comment if you wish _____

_____

_____

33.0 What do see as the one, two, or three major issues in community economic development that your community has to deal with? List up to three only.

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

34.0 Thinking about the major issues you just described, is it likely that your Municipality will be able to solve them without provincial government aid?

Yes No

Comment if you wish _____

_____

_____

35.0 Thinking about your responses to Questions 32, 33, 34 and 35, what should be the role of our Municipality in furthering and/or achieving economic development goals and objectives? Complete the sentence by checking off as many roles as you think are appropriate or provide your own. Place a second check-mark by the phrase you agree the most with.

"The Municipality should..."

___-leave it mainly to the business community and business leaders, but provide public leadership and advice

___-finance planning studies, consultants and organizational costs, but nothing else

___-formally approve and adopt an economic development plan or strategy

___-contribute to economic development projects only by providing the normal range of services and infrastructure that a municipality is charged with

___-become a financial partner in private sector projects and business enterprises when significant or important employment and other community benefits can be expected

___ form a venture capital corporation in partnership with local and other business corporations

___ keep "arms length" from any business or industrial venture project even though the project fits well into an approved economic development plan.

___ leave the financing of economic development projects entirely to the province

Others:_____

F. This section asks about your awareness of provincial and federal programmes and the extent to which they have been used.

38.0 Various provincial and federal programs are listed below. Please circle the appropriate response as to whether your community has taken advantage of the programme and whether or not you were satisfied.

	Programme applied for?	Were you Satisfied?
Financial Programmes		
1 Business Improvement Loans	Yes No	Yes No
2 Alberta Opportunity Company	Yes No	Yes No
3 Federal Business Development Bank	Yes No	Yes No
4 Small Business Equity Corporation Programme	Yes No	Yes No
Counselling for small business from Alberta Economic Development and Trade		
5 Business Counselling	Yes No	Yes No
6 Management Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
7 Community Economic Development	Yes No	Yes No
8 Business Site Locations	Yes No	Yes No

	Programme applied for?	Were you Satisfied?
Manpower–Provincial and Federal		
9 Alberta Wage Subsidy Programme	Yes No	Yes No
10 Alberta Training Programs Skill Investment	Yes No	Yes No
11 Alberta Youth Employment Training Program	Yes No	Yes No
12 Job Development	Yes No	Yes No
13 Skill Shortages	Yes No	Yes No
14 Innovations	Yes No	Yes No
Municipal and other local government assistance programs		
a) Alberta Culture		
15 Job Entry	Yes No	Yes No
16 Historical Publication Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
17 Local Restoration Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
18 Provincial Historic Resource Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
19 Registered Historic Resource Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
20 Special Historical Resource Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
21 Municipal Inventory Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
22 Provincial Inventory Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
23 Museum Assistance Program	Yes No	Yes No

	Programme applied for?	Were you Satisfied?
24 Community Recreation / Cultural Grant Programme	Yes No	Yes No
b) Manpower		
25 Summer Temporary Employment Programme	Yes No	Yes No
c) Municipal Affairs		
26 Revitalizing Downtown Alberta	Yes No	Yes No
d) Community Recreation / Cultural		
27 Grant Programme	Yes No	Yes No
28 Hosting Grant Programme	Yes No	Yes No
29 Regional Sports Festivals	Yes No	Yes No
30 Discover Alberta	Yes No	Yes No
31 Trail Development Financial Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
32 Municipal Recreation / Tourism Areas Programme	Yes No	Yes No
e) Travel Alberta		
33 Tourism Development Counselling	Yes No	Yes No
34 Senior Citizens Tourism Employment Programme	Yes No	Yes No
35 Tourism Events Promotional Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
36 Travel Alberta Zone Assistance Programme	Yes No	Yes No
37 Canada / Alberta Northern Development Subsidiary Agreement	Yes No	Yes No
38 Service Industry Training Seminars	Yes No	Yes No
39 Community Tourism Action Plan	Yes No	Yes No
40 Tourism Product and Facility Counselling Services	Yes No	Yes No
E. Canada /Alberta Subsidiary Agreement on Tourism Development	Yes No	Yes No
F. Mainstreet Canada (Heritage Canada Foundation)	Yes No	Yes No
G. Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation	Yes No	Yes No
H. The Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation	Yes No	Yes No
I. Community Futures	Yes No	Yes No

G. Based on your awareness of provincial and federal programs and your conception of the proper role of the Municipal Corporation in community economic development, please indicate topics which would assist the Municipal Services Branch in aiding your economic development efforts.

Legal Advice: _____

_____

_____

Interpretation Bulletins: _____

_____

_____

Comparative Statistics _____

_____

_____

Seminars and courses: _____

_____

_____

A List of Funding Programmes: _____

_____

_____

Information Bulletins: _____

_____

_____

Municipal Administrators Handbook (Inserts): _____

_____

_____

Advisory Services: _____

_____

_____

Other: _____

_____

_____

This questionnaire was completed by (please check one):

___The Chief Administrative Officer

___The Community Economic Development Officer

___The Chairman of the Community Economic Development Committee

___Other If "other", please state your position:_____

All responses will be kept confidential. Your personal identity and the name of your municipality will not be revealed in our report or in any data analyses provided to Alberta Municipal Affairs. You may be contacted in the near future by the research team to schedule a short interview. If you have any additional comments on community economic development, please feel free to include them on the back of this sheet or on a seperate piece of paper. Again, thank-you for your cooperation. This survey is being conducted by:

Neil Mac Donald
The Urban and Regional Research Lab
Faculty of Environmental Design
The University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. N.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2N 1N4

APPENDIX 2

ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SAMPLE SIZE, SELECTION CRITERIA, SURVEY PROCESS AND RESPONSE RATE

The Survey Questionnaire, "Facts and Opinions at the Municipal Corporate Level", was directed to 30 Alberta municipalities ranging in population size from 54,309 (Red Deer) to 991 (Vauxhall).

The Sample was targeted to be roughly 25% of Alberta cities and towns with populations of 1000 or greater, excluding Calgary and Edmonton. Six (or 42%) of the remaining 14 cities were surveyed.

We selected a sample of municipalities broadly representative of the size distribution of cities and towns in Alberta but also representative for geographic regions (eg. north, central, south). The selection was influenced by two further considerations: a desire to include at least two municipalities within each of the "influence" areas of Calgary and Edmonton; and a need to incorporate a selection of five (5) of the "Community Futures" projects. Four (4) of the Community Futures selections encompass more than one municipality; Crowsnest Pass has the only co-terminous municipal boundaries matching the programme boundaries.

Cities constitute a distinctive category because of their large population size relative to all other municipalities and because of their substantial administrative, financial and other community capacities to engage in economic development activities. Below the city category, we postulated that towns of the order of 5,000 to 10,000 population would distinguish themselves from lower-sized towns in the matter of organization and implementation of economic development projects or planning; and in their views about issues. Of the 22 larger towns, 10 (or 45%) were surveyed. We expected towns with less than 5,000 population (but more than 1000 pop.) would not all be engaged in economic

development, and that those who were would exhibit certain distinguishing characteristics, attitudes or opinions. Of the 65 smaller towns, 8 (or 12%) were surveyed.

From the foregoing considerations, four categories were established:

1. "Community Futures" municipalities (three being aggregations of more than one municipality); 5 selected, 5 responded.
2. Cities; 6 selected, 6 responded.
3. Towns of population 5,000 to 10,000; 10 selected, 9 responded .
4. Towns of population less than 5,000; 9 selected, 8 responded.

Twenty-eight (28) municipalities responded, for a return rate of 93%.

The Questionnaire was mailed at the end of February, 1988, to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of the municipality and the programme coordinator of the Community Futures entities. In a preamble to the Questionnaire, and by telephone follow-ups, the CAO was advised that some or all of the questions could be -- and possibly would have to be -- answered in consultations with the Mayor and/or the Economic Development Officer (where one was appointed). This procedure recognized that, in most cases, economic development activities are carried out largely independently of the municipal administration. On the other hand, since the study had as its major aim to examine the roles of the municipal corporation in community economic development, it was necessary for the CAO or the Mayor to be the responsible respondent.

In the matter of questions directed to "attitudes", "perceptions" and "opinions", it was assumed that the CAO could -- and would -- reasonably reflect the views of political and other community leadership where such was called for or implied in certain questions posed. This expectation has its obvious defects. However, given the budget available for the research, this defect was inescapable.

Following a scan of the returns, 9 respondents were selected for face to face interviews. The selection was representative of northern, southern and central regions of the province. Interviews extended over a period of one to two hours. These interviews were conducted according to a prepared "script", thereby ensuring a consistent approach in all cases. The interviews explored clarifications and elaborations suggested by the responses obtained to certain questions in the Questionnaire. Some new areas of explorations were also opened -- for example, an exploration of what respondent's understood by "self-help" and what they thought of Regional Planning Commissions engaging in economic development activity.

APPENDIX 3

DATA AND COMMENTARY ON THE MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A Supplement to the Report: "Building Capacity for Self-Help: A Survey on the Role of Municipalities in Community Economic Development in Alberta"

Prepared By:

Policy Research Services
Municipal Services Branch
Alberta Municipal Affairs

STATISTICAL PROFILE OF THE SURVEY URBAN MUNICIPALITIES*

The profiles, in this Appendix, were developed separately from the survey using Alberta Municipal Affairs publication entitled Residential Property Survey 1987. In part, this information is to better inform the study findings, round them out if you will, and ascertain if the surveyed municipalities are unique from the average. Although, no attempt has been made to correlate the findings in these profiles with those from the survey, the reader is encouraged to do so.

The numerical profile consists of four sets of data, in Tables 1 to 4 which are located at the end of this Appendix. Some explanation of the statistics are provided in the following text and notes in the Tables. For further details regarding the indicators you should refer to the above noted report. However, effort has been made to relate these statistics to the topic of community economic development (C.E.D.).

As you will notice, data in the tables are grouped: cities, large towns (5,000-10,000 population) and smaller towns (1,000-5,000 population). Also, two averages are calculated: the sample or group average and the All Town or the All City Average. For the cities, the All City Average is based on 17 centres. In the case of the towns, 109 centres are used for this average.

TABLE 1 - OBSERVATIONS AND SUMMARY

- The 15 cities (excluding Calgary and Edmonton) average over 24,400 people, and have grown a total of 4% since 1982. The average size of the 6 surveyed cities is higher at 28,800 people, with a growth rate of 7% (primarily in St. Albert and Red Deer).

* *A special thanks to Ralph Fuerderer for compiling the data in Tables 1 to 4.*

53 670 08 16 88

- The larger towns surveyed have about 2.5 times the population compared to the smaller towns surveyed. The population in these smaller towns (2,669) is much closer to the average Alberta town (2,841). The population growth since 1982 was the greatest in the larger towns (5.2%).

- The cities, except Airdrie and Wetaskiwin, are regional centres and have a sufficient variety of business services. All of the larger towns (except Whitecourt) are sub-regional centres and the smaller towns serve all or part of a nearby district. The exception in these small towns is Grand Centre and Athabasca which are sub-regional centres. This higher order niche for those two towns is a response likely to their northern location and disperse settlement pattern.

- On the standard 3 bedroom bungalow, the Total Property Taxes (TPT) are the highest on average in the cities and smaller towns groups, while Market Values are the highest in the larger towns. In terms of property tax incidence (TPT as a percentage of market value) the cities on average are 1.7% while the All Town average is 1.7%. The highest tax incidence is recorded in the smaller town group with high total property taxes and low market values. (The Town of Vauxhall is the exception with the highest taxes and the lowest total property taxes).

- When the annual charges for utilities and property taxes are combined, the overall annual averages for the cities ($1,668), and towns ($1,611) are similar. However, combined taxes in the surveyed cities and small towns are several hundred dollars above the averages while the large town group is more than a hundred dollars below the All Town average.

- Without further indepth analysis of all the cities and towns, the surveyed municipalities cover a range of population (with the exception of a metropolitan area like Edmonton and Calgary) and several service centre types. The taxation levels are above average in the cities and small towns, thus leaving some 'tax room' in the large towns. In terms of community economic development, you might expect more activities and organizational strength in the regional service centres (primarily the cities).

- You might also expect the C.E.D. efforts in the small towns would be modest in extent and different in scope, because of their small economic niches and comparatively high taxes. In part, this may be due to distance from markets and resources (natural, human and financial).

The opportunity for strengthening the C.E.D. activities would appear to be the greatest in the larger towns surveyed. Centres which appear to have more 'revenue room' just to reach the average taxation level, include: Red Deer, Wetaskiwin, Hinton, Edson, Taber, Peace River, Whitecourt and Fort McLeod. One needs to recognize the above summary comments is applicable only to the extent that the municipality features three bedroom bungalow developments.

TABLE 2 - OBSERVATIONS AND SUMMARY

- The statistics featured in Table 2 are for the entire municipality. The general fiscal capacity of an urban municipality can be depicted using equalized assessment (the base from which taxes are generated), divided by the number of dwellings: hence Equalized Assessment per dwelling.

- The higher order centres on average have a larger fiscal capacity and the extent they are above this average, the municipality may have a better chance of finding some room to generate tax revenues. In this regard, the surveyed cities all have below average fiscal capacity, the smaller towns are just above average, while all the larger towns have above fiscal capacity.

- You can gauge the "qualify" or the sophistication of the residential development in the municipa ty, using the residential portion of the equalized assessment divided by dwelling units (REAPDW). This statistic can be a proxy for the level and quality of services in a municipality. Above average REAPDW probably means a better level and quality of service. As you might expect, cities have a higher "quality" by the larger average which exists in the towns. St. Albert and Fort McMurray have the highest quality of all cities. The qualify of residential development in larger towns is slightly above the All Town average, with Hinton leading the way. For the small towns, most have below average residential "quality", with the exception of Coaldale and Hanna which are more comparable to the cities.

- Again you could expect the average Personal Income to be above average in cities and below average in towns and this is the case (when examining the All Town and All City averages).

- For the surveyed cities, with the exception of the highest incomes in Fort McMurray and St. Albert, this group would have similar incomes to those in the larger towns surveyed. While Hinton, in the larger town group, has above average personal incomes, as Grande Cache has for the smaller towns surveyed.

In general, the larger towns surveyed have above average fiscal capacity, higher than average personal incomes and slightly above quality of the residential development. In these centres, where economic development may well be a pressing issue, it could be receiving particular municipal attention or local self-help. In contract, C.E.D. activities in the surveyed cities might be modest because they and smaller towns have the lowest fiscal capacity and lower than average personal incomes. It is in these latter two groups that even if C.E.D. is a concern, self-help initiatives would appear to be constrained compared to the larger towns surveyed.

TABLE 3 - SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

- In reference to the standard bungalow, the Municipal Tax Portion of the total property tax is over 50% (meaning the balance is from requisitions, largely from School Authorities).

- The amount of taxes collected for general municipal purposes is the greatest in the small towns ($863) and it decreases for the larger towns ($621) and in the cities ($822) that were surveyed. This trend is consistent with the All Towns and All Cities averages.

- Eight of the ten larger towns are below the average Municipal Taxation Effort compared to the All Town average. Both Rocky Mountain House and Hinton are collecting these taxes above the average, while Whitecourt has exceptionally low municipal taxes, nearly 53% below the average (on the sample bungalow).

- These total municipal taxes can be placed in relation to $1,000 of equalized assessment, thus providing an (equalized) Municipal Tax Mill Rate (EMTMR). Above average EMTMR implies the centre's municipal taxes are an above average burden to the taxpayer.

- The smaller towns and cities surveyed are near and above average using the EMTMR index. The extreme centres would include Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Valleyview and Vauxhall. The large town group has a below average EMTMR. This finding corresponds to the "tax revenue room" discussed earlier for this large town group.

- The Equalized Assessment "Mix" is related to the portion of 'business' assessment in the municipality. Cities, as you might expect, have a greater amount of this assessment than found in towns. However, this is not true for all the municipalities surveyed. The surveyed towns have above average 'business' related equalized assessment, while the city group is below the All City average. There are several noticable exceptions. Fort McMurray and St. Albert have the lowest percentages of 'business' assessment and the highest total property taxes. Similarly Coaldale has a lowest mix with average total property tax and the highest quality residential development (Table 2 REAPDW). Certainly those with below average 'business' assessment mix might well be active in their C.E.D. pursuits namely St. Albert, Fort McMurray, Airdrie, High River and Coaldale.

- The Equalized Assessment Trend in the last year and the past 5 years has been positive for both the cities and the towns surveyed and on average. Without knowing the annexation activities, the equalized assessment for the surveyed cities and small towns are nearly double their respective averages. Equalized Assessment in the large town group has been about average.

The statistics in Table 3, can be used to identify the municipalities which have: some tax room, in both Total Property Taxes and Municipal Taxation; below average amounts of Equalized Assessment; and an above average Equalized Assessment growth rate for the past 5 years and last year. Such a correlation identified 6 centres namely: Red Deer, Airdrie, Taber, Whitecourt, High River and Coaldale. All of these

centres would appear to have conditions favorable for supporting C.E.D. activities. A secondary list where some, but not all, of the above C.E.D. conditions are met would include: Wetaskiwin, Brooks, St. Paul, Fort MacLeod, Grande Cache and Bow Island.

TABLE 4 - SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

- Table 4 examines supplementary school requisitions and these requisitions are expressed as a mill rate. These school related statistics can often indicate assessment wealth of a surrounding rural area. This means a possibility of "freeing up" some 'municipal taxation room' or an increase of the fiscal constraint.

- For the surveyed centres there would appear to be some 'municipal tax room' for Airdrie, Wetaskiwin, Edson, Taber, Whitecourt, Rocky Mountain House, Grande Cache, Hanna, Valleyview and Vauxhall.

- Conversely the centres that appear to have some constraints would be Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Brooks, Stettler, High River, Coaldale, Grand Centre, and Athabasca.

TABLE ONE

A. CITIES	POPULATION 1987	POPULATION % CHANGE 1982-87	TOTAL PROPERTY TAXES ($)	MARKET VALUE 1987 ($)	SERVICE CENTRE TYPE	TOT. TAX AS % OF MARKET VALUE (%)	TOTAL UTIL. & PROPERTY TAX ($/YEAR)
Red Deer	54,309	11.83	1,177.08	85,000	REG	1.4	1,492.44
St. Albert	37,008	12.21	1,436.64	73,000	REG	2.0	1,749.12
Fort McMurray	34,949	4.09	1,995.19	100,000	REG	2.0	2,380.15
Grande Prairie	26,471	9.10	1,427.22	79,000	REG	1.8	1,996.70
Airdrie	10,461	4.81	1,037.94	75,000	DIST	1.4	1,602.96
Wetaskiwin	10,103	2.09	1,168.09	70,000	S.REG	1.7	1,596.10
SAMPLE AVERAGE	**28,884**	**7.36**	**1,373.69**	**80,333**	**N/A**	**1.7**	**1,802.91**
AVERAGE (ALL CITIES)	**24,448**	**4.76**	**1,219.03**	**80,176**	**N/A**	**1.5**	**1,667.79**
B. TOWNS (Group 1)							
Brooks	9,464	0.46	1,374.93	95,000	S.REG	1.4	1,603.35
Hinton	8,629	-2.15	1,319.75	95,000	S.REG	1.4	1,478.75
Edson	7,323	16.40	970.04	75,000	S.REG	1.3	1,344.56
Taber	6,382	6.58	951.78	76,000	S.REG	1.3	1,285.86
Peace River	6,355	5.16	850.99	79,000	S.REG	1.1	1,444.09
Whitecourt	5,737	6.08	766.33	85,000	DIST	0.9	1,197.01
Rocky Mtn. House	5,261	11.11	1,124.49	80,000	S.REG	1.4	1,436.03
Stettler	5,147	0.21	1,350.79	75,000	S.REG	1.8	1,848.79
St. Paul	5,128	5.00	1,107.40	80,000	S.REG	1.4	1,552.36
High River	5,096	3.14	1,174.93	88,000	S.REG	1.3	1,576.93
SAMPLE AVERAGE	6,452	5.20	1,099.14	82,800	N/A	1.3	1,476.77
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	2,841	5.25	1,199.11	72,016	N/A	1.7	1,611.09
C. TOWNS (Group 2)							
Coaldale	4,811	4.66	1,201.84	70,000	DIST	1.7	1,557.75
Grande Centre	3,655	16.18	1,346.25	95,000	S.REG	1.4	1,821.45
Fort MacLeod	3,123	-0.51	1,244.75	75,000	DIST	1.7	1,640.57
Grande Cache	3,646	-21.15	1,143.59	55,000	DIST	2.1	1,398.83
Hanna	3,017	6.68	1,238.40	80,000	DIST	1.5	1,734.90
Valleyview	2,218	7.62	1,425.91	78,500	DIST	1.8	1,874.71
Athabaska	1,970	13.81	1,389.70	80,000	S.REG	1.7	1,705.71
Bow Island	1,566	9.74	1,121.10	85,000	S.DIST	1.3	1,588.50
Vauxhall	991	-5.44	1,624.27	58,000	S.DIST	2.8	1,968.07
SAMPLE AVERAGE	**2,777**	**3.51**	**1,303.98**	**75,167**	**N/A**	**1.8**	**1,698.94**
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	**2,841**	**5.25**	**1,199.11**	**72,016**	**N/A**	**1.7**	**1,611.09**

TABLE TWO

A. CITIES	EQUALIZED ASSESS. per DWELL 1987 ($/DW.)	E.A.P.DW INDEX (AVG.=100)	RES. EQ. ASSESS. per DWELL. ($/DW.)	R.E.A.P. DW. INDEX (AVG.=100)	PERSONAL INCOME INDEX (AVG.=100)
Red Deer	18,030	81.1	11,582	97.5	98
St. Albert	19,985	89.9	15,948	134.2	121
Fort McMurray	19,552	87.9	15,071	126.9	146
Grande Prairie	18,734	84.3	10,847	91.3	99
Airdrie	21,726	97.7	14,713	123.8	82
Wetaskiwin	16,931	76.1	10,471	88.1	81
SAMPLE AVERAGE	19,160	86.2	13,105	110.3	105
AVERAGE (ALL CITIES)	22,233	100.0	11,880	100.0	102
B. TOWNS (Group 1)					
Brooks	16,411	105.4	10,759	105.2	93
Hinton	25,368	162.9	13,582	132.8	115
Edson	18,163	116.7	9,834	96.1	88
Taber	17,840	114.6	11,059	108.1	84
Peace River	18,554	119.2	9,879	96.6	97
Whitecourt	19,135	122.9	10,367	101.3	91
Rocky Mtn. House	16,437	105.6	9,628	94.1	75
Stettler	17,315	111.2	10,930	106.8	89
St. Paul	18,132	116.5	11,765	115.0	74
High River	18,082	116.1	12,477	122.0	91
SAMPLE AVERAGE	18,544	119.1	11,028	107.8	90
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	15,570	100.0	10,231	100.0	84
C. TOWNS (Group 2)					
Coaldale	17,108	109.9	14,382	140.6	81
Grande Centre	17,083	109.7	9,855	96.3	80
Fort MacLeod	14,040	90.2	8,314	81.3	72
Grande Cache	19,394	124.6	11,453	111.9	106
Hanna	16,873	108.4	11,139	108.9	85
Valleyview	16,074	103.2	9,155	89.5	69
Athabaska	18,350	117.9	9,481	92.7	78
Bow Island	15,066	96.8	9,027	88.2	81
Vauxhall	16,350	105.0	9,723	95.0	78
SAMPLE AVERAGE	16,704	107.3	10,281	100.5	81
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	15,570	100.0	10,231	100.0	84

TABLE THREE

CITIES	TOTAL PROPERTY TAXES (TPT) ($)	TOTAL MUNICIPAL TAX (TMT) ($ 1987)	T.M.T. INDEX (AVG.=100)	EQUAL. MUN. TAX MILL RATE (EMTMR)	E.M.T.M.R. INDEX (AVG.=100)	EQUAL. ASSESS. MIX 1987	EQUAL. ASSESS. MIX TREND 1982-87	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT TRENDS PAST 5 YEARS (1982-87) (%)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT TRENDS PAST 1 YEAR (1986-87) (%)
d Deer	1,177.08	635.00	94.0	43.0	76.3	35.8	↓	13.3	6.3
. Albert	1,436.64	866.00	128.0	66.0	117.1	20.2	-	11.5	4.3
rt McMurray	1,995.19	1,314.00	194.0	81.0	143.7	23.0	↓	10.1	-4.9
ande Prairie	1,427.22	777.00	114.0	71.0	126.0	42.1	↓	-12.9	5.6
rdrie	1,037.94	666.00	98.0	52.0	92.3	32.3	-	34.1	4.3
taskiwin	1,168.09	672.00	99.0	56.0	99.4	38.1	-	4.2	6.8
MPLE AVERAGE	**1,373.69**	**821.67**	**121.2**	**61.5**	**109.1**	**31.9**	**N/A**	**10.1**	**3.7**
ERAGE (ALL CITIES)	**1,219.03**	**678.71**	**100.0**	**56.4**	**100.0**	**39.3**	**-**	**5.6**	**1.5**
TOWNS (Group 1)									
ooks	1,374.93	703.19	94.3	45.0	73.3	34.4	↓	15.1	7.1
nton	1,319.75	794.60	106.6	49.0	79.9	46.5	↓	21.6	0.3
son	970.04	596.55	80.0	72.0	117.3	45.9	-	25.2	6.5
ber	951.78	542.34	72.7	42.0	68.4	38.0	↓	20.0	4.1
ace River	850.99	408.41	54.8	65.0	105.9	46.8	-	6.9	-1.3
itecourt	766.33	351.20	47.1	47.0	76.6	45.8	↓	7.0	7.1
cky Mtn. House	1,124.49	853.18	114.4	58.0	94.5	41.4	-	16.4	5.4
ettler	1,350.79	693.00	92.9	54.0	88.0	36.9	↓	7.8	3.3
. Paul	1,107.40	664.44	89.1	56.0	91.3	35.1	↓	-8.3	2.9
gh River	1,174.93	604.66	81.1	40.0	65.2	31.0	↓	7.8	1.6
MPLE AVERAGE	**1,099.14**	**621.16**	**83.3**	**52.8**	**86.0**	**40.2**	**N/A**	**12.0**	**3.7**
ERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	**1,210.32**	**745.75**	**100.0**	**61.4**	**100.0**	**33.6**	**↓**	**10.6**	**3.0**
TOWNS (Group 2)									
aldale	1,201.84	609.38	81.7	35.0	57.0	15.9	↓	35.2	7.4
ande Centre	1,346.25	816.60	109.5	54.0	88.0	42.3	↓	0.7	-3.2
rt MacLeod	1,244.57	743.57	99.7	59.0	96.2	40.8	↑	25.8	10.7
ande Cache	1,143.59	810.49	108.7	63.0	102.7	40.9	↑	24.6	-7.1
nna	1,238.40	957.85	128.4	71.0	115.7	34.0	↓	23.7	3.6
lleyview	1,425.91	1,070.58	143.6	77.0	125.5	43.0	↓	8.5	5.8
habaska	1,389.70	850.87	114.1	60.0	97.8	48.3	↓	14.1	3.4
w Island	1,121.10	678.99	91.0	51.0	83.1	40.1	↑	36.8	7.2
uxhall	1,624.27	1,232.06	165.2	77.0	125.5	40.5	↓	21.6	3.1
MPLE AVERAGE	**1,303.96**	**863.38**	**115.8**	**60.8**	**99.1**	**38.4**	**N/A**	**21.2**	**3.4**
ERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	**1,210.32**	**745.75**	**100.0**	**61.4**	**100.0**	**33.6**	**↓**	**10.6**	**3.0**

te: Equalized Assessment Mix (1982-87) ↓ declining, ↑ increasing, - stable.

TABLE FOUR

A. CITIES	SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL REQUISITION REQUISITION ($/YEAR)	SUPPLEMENTARY REQUISITION INDEX (AVG.=100)	SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL REQUISITION (EQUALIZED) MILL RATE	SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL REQUISITION MILL RATE (AVG.=100)
Red Deer	530	102	30.0	93
St. Albert	556	107	27.0	83
Fort McMurray	681	131	39.0	120
Grande Prairie	627	120	37.0	114
Airdrie	357	69	23.0	71
Wetaskiwin	479	92	28.8	89
SAMPLE AVERAGE	**538**	**104**	**30.8**	**95**
AVERAGE (ALL CITIES)	**521**	**100**	**32.4**	**100**
B. TOWNS (Group 1)				
Brooks	662	159	30.0	107
Hinton	503	121	24.0	85
Edson	331	79	24.0	85
Taber	390	94	28.0	100
Peace River	408	98	28.0	100
Whitecourt	400	96	23.0	82
Rocky Mtn. House	251	60	13.0	46
Stettler	618	148	38.0	135
St. Paul	414	99	28.0	100
High River	547	131	37.0	132
SAMPLE AVERAGE	**452**	**109**	**27.3**	**97**
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	**417**	**100**	**28.1**	**100**
C. TOWNS (Group 2)				
Coaldale	553	133	24.0	85
Grande Centre	507	122	33.0	117
Fort MacLeod	460	110	32.0	114
Grande Cache	318	76	17.0	60
Hanna	257	62	18.0	64
Valleyview	324	78	22.0	78
Athabaska	504	121	37.0	132
Bow Island	427	103	29.0	103
Vauxhall	374	90	27.0	96
SAMPLE AVERAGE	**414**	**99**	**26.6**	**94**
AVERAGE (ALL TOWNS)	**417**	**100**	**28.1**	**100**

Source: Alberta Municipal Affairs. Residential Property Survey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashton, Wm. *The Provincial-Municipal Government Interface*. Edmonton: Municipal Affairs, Municipal Services Branch, Policy and Research Services, 1987.

Baker, Harold. "The Community as a Learning Lab". *The Journal Of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.1, (March/April 1987): 16-23.

Baldwin, Tom. How Alberta General Municipal Plans Have Addressed Economic Development. *Alberta Planning Exchange*. Calgary: Community Planning Association Of Alberta, March, 1988.

Chanter, Ed. "Economic Development Plans-What are They". *AACIP News*, Vol. 5, No.4, (Nov./Dec. 1984): p. 11-12.

Cuff, George B. *Economic Development: A Politician's Dilemma*.. Community Planning and Economic Development; 1988 Annual Seminar. Mackenizie Regional Planing Commission. 1988.

Davidson, Gary. "Divorced Realities". *The Journal Of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.1, (March/April 1987): 8-15.

_____. "A helping Hand". *The Journal of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.2, (May/June 1987): 4-5.

Dommel, Paul R. *Financial Constraints and Community Development*.. Washington D.C.: Community Economic Development Task Force, n.d.

Douglas, David. "An Agenda for Action in Community Development in Canada". *The Journal Of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.1, (March/April 1987): 8-15.

Galbraith, Scott. "A "Planner" by Any Other Name." *AACIP News*, Vol. 5, No.4, (Nov./Dec. 1984): p. 4.

Dykeman, Floyd. "A prescription for a Healthy Community." *The Journal of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.2, (May/June 1987): 48-55.

Hastings, John. "Strategy Identified to Increase Canadian Content of Municipal Purchases". *Forum*.. Toronto: (September/October 1986): 3-4.

Jankunis, Frank. "Small Towns and Private Enterprise". *AACIP News*, Vol. 5, No.4, (Nov./Dec. 1984): 7.

Kemp, Roger. "Raising Revenues But Not Taxes." *The Journal of Community Development*. Vol.1, No.2, (May/June 1987): 38-39.

Kitchen, Harry M. *The Role For Local Government in Economic Development*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Economic Council, 1985.

Laux, F. A. *Municipal Bonusses and Tax Exemptions to Entice Private Developments*. Alberta Law Review. Vol. XXV, No. 2, 1987:224-248.

Newton, Philip, and Martin Thomas. "Municipal Economic Development Strategies Under the Municipal Partnership Program.". *Interaction*. Toronto, Ontario: Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research., Number 61, September, 1987.

Perks, William T. *An AMA Exchange: Local Economic Development Iniatives:What Was Said. What Might Have Been Said*. Edmonton, Municipal Services Branch, Alberta Municpal Affairs, 1988.

Perks, William T., and Neil Mac Donald. *Selecting Strategic Development Options: Experience in the Crowsnest Pass*. Conference proceedings: Resolving Rural Developments Conflicts Conference. St. Andrews, New Brunswick: Mt Allison University, June 8-11, 1988.

Ross, David P. *From the Roots Up: Economic Development as if Community Mattered*. New York:The Bootstrap Press,1986.

Scott, Alan. "The Economic Development Officer". *AACIP News*, Vol. 5, No.4, (Nov./Dec. 1984):8.

Seasons, Mark. *Strategic Economic Development Planning and The Management of Change*. Unpublished manuscript, 1988.

Webster, Doug. "The Role of the Planner in Economic Development". *AACIP News*, Vol. 5, No.4, (Nov./Dec. 1984): pp. 5-6.

Community Economic Development and the Future. Proceedings of a Conference Held in Banff Park Lodge, Banff, Alberta, June 20-23, 1884, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1984.

Alberta. *Municipal Government Act*. Edmonton: 1985.

Alberta. *Municipal Taxation Act*. Edmonton: 1985.

Alberta. *Planning Act*. Edmonton: 1985.

Alberta. Research and Development Branch, Alberta Municipal Affairs. *Development Incentives: The Advantages and Disadvantages of Municipal Financial and Land Use Incentives*. Edmonton, 1987.

Canadian Institute of Planners. *National Conference Theme: Sustainable Community: The Next Frontier*. Sudbury Ontario, 1983.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *How to Organize for Economic Development*. Ottawa , n.d.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *How to Prepare an Economic Development Strategy*. Ottawa, n.d.

Heartland Centre for Leadership Development. *The Entrepreneurial Community: A Strategic Planning Approach to Community Survival*. Lincoln, Nebraska, n.d.

_____. *Clues to Rural Community Survival*. Lincoln, Nebraska, n.d.

SRI International. *Developing Public-Private Approaches to Community Problem Solving: A Guide for Local Officials*. Menlo Park, Calif, 1982.

Town of Morinville. Economic Development Board. *Iniatives '87: Selected Readings*. March 26, 1987.